

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.*

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

Prof. J. E. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,

LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.

Prof. O. FLAMSTEAD

WALTERS, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*

Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., Harvard University.

Vol. XXX

AUG., SEPT., 1916

Nos. 5, 6

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
The Berlin Sappho Again. J. M. EDMONDS	129	Moulton's <i>Early Zoroastrianism and Early Religious Poetry of Persia</i> . W. H. D. ROUSE	163
The Homeric Hymns. V. T. L. AGAR	133	Miller's <i>Xenophon: Cyropaedia</i> . E. C. MARCHANT	165
Euripides Furens. J. F. DOBSON	136	Rolle's <i>Suetonius</i> . J. WIGHT DUFF	166
On an Alleged New Fragment of Epimenides. J. U. POWELL	139	Van Hoesen's <i>Roman Cursive Writing</i> . J. E. SANDYS	169
On Trajection of Words or Hyperbaton. J. P. POSTGATE	142	Radin's <i>Jews among the Greeks and Romans</i> . FRANK GRANGER	171
Some Cruces in Virgil Re-considered. J. S. PHILLIMORE	146		
Jupiter and the Triumphator. W. WARDE FOWLER	153		
NOTES:		SHORT NOTICES:	
Aesch. P. V. 354. E. J. BROOKS	158	Meillet's <i>Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes</i> . E. PURDIE	172
Polybius III. 71. 4. W. R. PATON	158	NOTES AND NEWS	173
Tam . . . Quam. E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN	158	CORRESPONDENCE	174
REVIEWS:		ERASMIANUM (Vide p. 72 et 128)	175
Ridgeway's <i>Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races</i> . R. R. MARETT	158	BOOKS RECEIVED	176
Droop's <i>Archaeological Excavation</i> . HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE	162		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 29 BEACON STREET

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Hon. Secretaries, Mr. W. H. Duke, Jesus College, Cambridge, and Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W.; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. G. E. K. Brauholtz, The University, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss D. Watson, 7, Hughenden Road, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, M.A., The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, N.W.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and Mrs. R. M. Gray, 13, Marine Lines, Bombay.

TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL

Representative of the Teaching Profession
(Constituted by Order in Council, February 29, 1912).

In accordance with the above-mentioned Order,

A REGISTER OF TEACHERS

is now maintained by the Council.

For Information apply to THE SECRETARY, TEACHERS' REGISTRATION COUNCIL,
47, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

THE MINOR POEMS OF VERGIL

Comprising the CULEX, DIRAE, LYDIA, MORETUM,
COPA, PRIAPEIA, AND CATALEPTON

METRICALLY TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY
JOSEPH J. MOONEY

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED A TRANSLATION OF FOCA'S
LIFE OF VERGIL
WHILE THE LATIN TEXT OF THE POEMS IS APPENDED

BIRMINGHAM
CORNISH BROTHERS LTD.
39, NEW STREET

3s. 6d. net

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C.

Pa
kn
an
on
no
sev
Sa
d.
in
sik
thi
I h
of
ex
wi
to
a
ph
Sc
ex
sti
tw
scr
inv
tog
I
pe
ha
off
fra
co

wh
ref
—
me
n

The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1916

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE BERLIN SAPPHO AGAIN.

THE tenth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* has added so much to our knowledge of the two great Lesbians and their dialect, that second thoughts on the earlier new fragments become not only desirable but necessary. The seventh-century vellum fragments of Sappho, first published in *Sitzungsberichte d. Königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften* in 1902 and re-edited in *Berliner Klassikertexte* V. 2 (1907), were dealt with in this *Review* in June and August, 1909.¹ I had intended to postpone re-discussion of these fragments till I had been to examine them at Berlin; but as that will now be impossible for some years to come, I have contented myself with a very careful re-examination of the photographs procured for me by Dr. Schubart seven years ago. This re-examination has included a new reconstitution of the torn, creased, and twisted originals by the method described in my earlier papers, a method involving in one case the piecing together of as many as twelve tracings. I have found, also, that greater experience of such attempts at restoration has made it possible in some cases to offer plausible suggestions for very fragmentary lines in which formerly I could see no clue.

With regard to the first fragment, of which the first extant line begins with *τεθνάκην*, and which is numbered III.

¹ Reprinted (text only) in *The New Fragments of Alcaeus, Sappho, and Corinna*, 1909.

in the reprint, there is not much to be said. In l. 1 for *ἀνήλυθεν* read *ὀνήλυθεν*. In l. 4 read *ἔειπέ μ[οι]*. In l. 9 *μεμναισθ' οἴσθα* seems to have been corrected to *μ[ε]μναισθ' οἴσθα*, itself probably a mistake for *μέμναι φοῖσθα*; it is doubtful whether we should write *μέμναι* or *μέμνᾱ* for the Imperative, though the latter would be expected; cf. *μεμνα* (glossed *μναι*), probably Indicative, in the new ode *Oxy. Pap. X. 1231*, fr. 1, col. 1 (C. R. May 1914). In l. 12 read *ὄσσ' ἄμμ[ες]*. In ll. 20 and 21, which I formerly read:

*βρενθείω π[ρ]οχόωι μύρ]ω
ἐξαλείψας κα[ὶ] βασιληῖω[ι],*

I still find it impossible to read *βασιληῖω* immediately after *βρενθείω* so as to bring it into line with *Athen. XV. 690 E*. In *Athenaeus*, where the preceding sentence prepares us for two separate kinds of myrrh, the words of the quotation intermediate between *βρενθείω* and *βασιληῖω* have apparently fallen out. We now know this to be the case in another passage of Sappho quoted by *Athen. XI. 460 D*, appearing in his MSS. as *πόλλα δ' ἀνάρθημα ποτήρια καλαίφαις*, where there were two puzzles, the last word and the tautology of *πόλλα ἀνάρθημα*. In the original, *Sappho Oxy. Pap. X. 1232*, fr. 1, col. 2, l. 8, the passage reads *πόλλα δ' [ἐλ]ίγματα χρύσεια κάμματα | πορφύ[ρ]α κ[αὶ] ἄλλα τ' αὖ τ[ρ]ύ[ρ]α, ποίκιλ' ἄθύρματα, | ἀργύ[ρ]α τ'* *ἀνάρ[η]μα [ποτή]ρια καλέφαις*. It was evidently an extreme case of loss by homoioteleuton. It is perhaps no mere coincidence that in the passage before

us two out of four of the words intervening between *βρενθείω* and *βασιληῖω*, also (disregarding ι adscript) end in ω. In l. 25 read *κωῦτε το.*

In l. 4 of IV., the first extant word of which is *Σάρδε[σιν]*, read:

ὡς πο[τ' εἰ]ζώμεν β[ι]ον, ἄς ἔχῃ
σὲ θεᾶι *Φικέλαν* ἀρι-
γνώτῃ,

MS. *θεασικελαναρ* | *γνωτα*. Lines 16-18 I would now read thus:

πόλλα δὲ *ζαφοίταισ'* ἀγάνας ἐπι-
μναίσθεις' Ἀτθίδος ἱμέρω,
λέπταν ποι φρένα κῆρ' ἄσῃ βόρηται,

MS. *κη'ασα*. The elision-mark before *ασα* shows that we have here the Homeric *κῆρι*, 'heartily,' 'deeply,' as in *Il.* 9. 117 *et al.* The mark like an acute accent over the second upright stroke of π in *ποι* means 'read *τοι*'; but *ποι* here is equivalent to *που* 'I ween,' as in *Pindar P.* 5 *et al.* I now take *βόρηται* as Aeolic for *βαρείται*. I originally read *ἀγόνας*, but I am not certain now of the ο, though I still regard it as possible. *ἱμέρω* is the direct object to *ἐπιμναίσθεις* (sic MS.), and *ἀγάνας* Ἀτθίδος is Possessive. The Participle *ἐπιμναίσθεις*, Aorist, 'when she calls to mind,' is dependent on the Present Participle *ζαφοίταισα*, 'as she wanders abroad.' For the two Participles thus connected cf. *Alcaeus Oxy. Pap.* X. 1233, fr. 4 (C. R. May 1914) *θρώσκοντες . . . ἴσονται*, 'leaping to sit.' I had thought also of taking *ἱμέρω* as an Adjective, for *ἱμέριω* 'delightful,' as *πορφύρεα* for *πορφύρεα*, comparing for the two epithets without *καί* or *τε* several passages in *Alcaeus*; but this would inevitably have been taken wrong by the reader, and I prefer the slight awkwardness of the dependence of one Genitive on another, 'of the love of *Atthis*,' to supposing *Sappho* to have risked being misunderstood. Translate 'And oftentime, while our beloved wanders abroad, when she calls to mind the love of gentle *Atthis* I ween her tender breast is weighed down deep with longing.' The particle *ποι*, 'doubtless,' seems to me exactly what is wanted, implying that the writer feels that she is right but cannot prove it in

so many words. In the last stanza the MS. has *ὄξυβόη*, Third Person of *ὄξυβοέω* or *ὄξυβόημι*, for which I have a parallel below; cf. *ὄρημι*, not *ὄραμι* or *ὄραιμι*, for *ὄραω*. In l. 21 the MS. has *γαρνίει*. Of the last word of the piece there seems to be more visible than I had thought; at any rate there are marks which might be taken for the tops of *νρεο*; read *πα[ρ]ε[ν]νρεο[ί]σας*.

Fragment V., 'Intimations of Coming Death,' which contains *Γογγύλα* in the fourth extant line, I now restore thus:

του[.]
ἦρ' ἀ[.]
δῆρα τῷ[.]
Γογγύλα τ[ε] ἔφατ'· Ὅυ τι πᾶι τόδ'
ἔγνωσ[ε];
5 ἦ τι σᾶμ' ἐθέλ[ης] δεικνύναί τείας]
παῖσι· 'Μάλιστ', ἀμ[ε]ιβόμεν' ἔγω·
"Ερ-]
μας γ' εἰσηλθ', ἐπὶ [δὲ βλέποισ' ἔγω
ἔειπ[ον].
"Ὀδέσποτ' ἐπ[αν]άπωλόμαν]
[ο]ὐ μὰ γὰρ μάκαιραν [ἔγω θέαν]
10 [ο]ὐδεν' ἄδομ' ἔπαρθ' ἀγα[ν] ἔτ' ὀλβωι,
κατθάνην δ' ἱμερός τις ἄ[γ]ρεσέ με·
λῶ στᾶσαι εἰς δροσσόντ' ἀγ[ρ]ον σέ μ',
οἶ]
'Ατρήιδαν Ἀγαμ[έ]νον' ἀγαγες πρὶν]
[πᾶ]ν τε ταῖρη[τον] ἄνθρωπος Ἀχαιῶν·]
15 [χ]ρὴ δὲ τοῦτ' ἀπυλ[ε]πᾶν με φαῦ-]
[ο]ς, αἷτις ὁ[.]]

In l. 11 the MS. has η[ν], in l. 13 *ατρηιδην*, in l. 14 *δεθαιρη*. Translate:

'[It cannot be] long now' [said I].
'Surely,' said *Gongyla*, 'you cannot tell? or will you show your children a sign?' 'That I will,' answered I; 'Hermes came in unto me, and looking upon him I said "O master, I am altogether undone; for by the blessed Goddess I swear to thee I care not so much any longer that I am exalted unto prosperity, but a desire hath taken me to die. I would fain have thee set me in the dewy meadow whither aforetime thou leddest *Atreus*' son *Agamemnon* and all the chosen flower of the *Achaean*s. I must leave this light of day, seeing that I . . .'" The only substantial difference between this and my earlier restoration lies in the addition of l. 4 and of ll. 14-16 together

with the shortening of the middle line of the stanza.

Fragment VI. is written on the verso of Fragment III. The left-hand halves of ll. 4-13 are pretty clear. The rest has given me great trouble, but as the piece is now almost twice the length it was, I feel rewarded for my pains. My methods have been the same as I used in 1909. First, with the help of an inverted tracing of III. I reconstituted the MS. by correcting all twists and creases of the vellum. This enabled me to know exactly where to look for the traces of each line. Secondly, I put tracings of this and III. back to back, and was then able to eliminate all marks which might be due to the letters of the verso showing through. This was not always so difficult as it might seem, for the lines on the two sides do not always coincide.

Lines 19 and 20 are particularly valuable as showing the motive of the poem. It was a letter sent to the beloved Atthis, urging her to return from Andromeda to Sappho. It describes how Atthis awoke Sappho on the morning of her return with her pupils to Mitylene, probably from the first exile at Pyrrha (see scholion to the Berlin-Aberdeen fragment of Alcaeus). After l. 20 come eight lines, of which I can make out ἐννόμεναι at the extant beginning of l. 24, and 70 in the corresponding part of l. 27. Neither of these words gives a clue, and as about fifteen letters of each line are lost out of about twenty-five, without a clue further restoration is impossible. These eight lines may begin a new poem.

I now restore the fragment thus:

- Ψάπφ', ἡ μὲν οὕτως ἔγω' οὐ σε φιλήσω.
 ὦ φαῖν' ἄμμι, κῆξ' εὖναν λῦε τέαν
 πεφίλημ[έν]αν ἴσχυν, ὕδατι δὲ
 κρίνον [ὡς ἄ] κήρατον παρὰ κράγαν
 5 πέπλον Χίον ἀπύσχοισα λούεο.
 καὶ Κλεῦς σάων καβφέροισα γρύτα
 κροκόεντα λώπεά σοι ἐββάλλῃ καὶ
 πέπλον πορφύριον· καββεβλημμένῃ
 χλαίνῃ πέρ σ' ἐξ[ακ]ρισάντων ἀν-
 θῖνοι
 10 στέφανοι· περ[ὶ] κράτά σοι δέθεντες,
 καλθ' ὅσαι μαίν[ης] μ' ἄδρα καλλ[ή]ναι.

φρῦσσον, ὦ Πρα[ξί]νω, κύρ' υ' ἄμμι,
 ὧς
 παρθένων πό[τον] ἀδίω π[ο]ρήσω.
 ἔκ τινος γὰρ θέων [ταῦτ'] ἄμμι, τέκνον·
 15 ἡ μὲν ταῖδ' ἄμέρ[αι] προτὶ φιλτάταν
 Μυτιλάνναν π[ο]λίων ἡ] ἕξατ' ἤδη
 γυναικῶν ἃ κα[λίστα] Ψάπφ' ἀπύβην
 πεδ' ἄμμε[ν], ἃ μ[ατ]ήρ πεδὰ τῶν
 τέκνων.
 φίλτατ' Ἀτθι, μὲν ἄρα ταῦτα τὰ
 πρὶν
 20 ἐπ[ὶ] λάθει πάντ' ἡ] ὀμναῖσα' ἔτι;

[Eight more undeciphered lines.]

1 MS. ἐγ' ου 7 MS. σεββ 11 MS. οσα
 Translate:

'... Sappho, I swear if you come not forth I will love you no more. O rise and shine upon us and set free your beloved strength from the bed, and then like a pure lily beside the spring hold aloof your Chian robe and wash you in the water. And Cleis [her daughter] shall bring down from your presses saffron smock and purple robe; and let a mantle be put over you and crowned with a wreath of flowers tied about your head; and so come, sweet with all the beauty with which you make me mad. And do you, Praxinoa, roast us nuts, so that I may make the maidens a sweeter breakfast; for one of the Gods, child, has vouchsafed us a boon. This very day has Sappho the fairest of all women vowed that she will surely return unto Mitylene the dearest of all towns—return with us, the mother with her children.' Dearest Atthis, can you then forget all this that happened in the old days?

Lines 1-8, with the exception of l. 4 which is much improved, remain substantially as I first read them. In l. 1 οὕτως of course refers to the previous line; φιλήσω is like Plautus' *amabo* 'I pritheē.' For ἐξακρισάντων (Imperative) in l. 9 cf. Alcaeus *Oxy. Pap.* 1234, fr. 2, col. 1, l. 5 ἐπ[ὶ] ἀκρίσει and my note, C. R. May 1916. Sappho is represented wearing a wreath on a vase *Mus. Ital.* II. p. 51 = Reinach *Répert.* i. p. 525. The χλαίνα is for going out of doors, put right over the head as in the Tanagra terra-cottas, and surmounted not with a hat like theirs but with a

wreath of flowers. Line 11 with the unmistakable Sapphic ring was alone worth all my trouble. With *μαίνης* cf. Theocr. 5. 91. In l. 12 the name of the cook is of course uncertain, but the Doric *Πραξινόα* might have this Lesbian form in the Vocative. The ordinary Greek breakfast was wine with a little bread. Nuts were generally eaten with the wine after dinner. But this was evidently a great occasion, cf. l. 14. For the roasting of nuts cf. e.g. Theocr. 9. 20. The form *φρύσσον* instead of *φρύξον* is apparently from the by-form *φρύσσω* (see L. and S.); for *σσ* rather than *σ* in the Aorist cf. *πλάσσω* Hes. *Op.* 70 and *ἐπλάσσω* Theocr. 2. 109. The *πάρθενοι* of l. 13 are Sappho's pupils; the same line seems to imply that Atthis was in some sense second in command. The *ταῦτα* of l. 14 is shown by the asyndeton to refer to the following sentence. In l. 17 *Ψάπφα* is Nominative; this is the only place where the Nominative occurs in Lesbian poetry. In l. 20 *ὀμμυαίσας* is 1st Aorist Middle; the addition of the contrast 'or do you still remember' is idiomatic in Greek, but the words are better omitted in English. For further notes on the poem see C. R. August 1909. I should add that although it is clear that the poem is in stanzas of three lines, it is not certain which line is the first of the stanza.

Fragment VII., upon the verso of V., was left unrestored in my original paper and relegated to the appendix in the reprint. I have now ventured on a solution of the puzzle; but the initial gap, at any rate in the first few lines, is so great that it must not be regarded as necessarily *the* solution. The clue seems to me to lie in the words *ἴαν* (= *μία*) *ἤχον* . . . *παρθενίαν* . . . *ὠρρώδων* . . . *ἀτύξη*. It should be noted that the gaps, being on the left, must be filled by letters which when traced out will begin upon an even vertical || line. This poem, like most of the rest of what remains of this book, reports a conversation. Sappho reminds a woman friend how in an intimate talk on the eve of her marriage the friend regretted the coming loss of her virginity and the change in her life which it entailed, and how Sappho,

from the superior standpoint of the married woman, tried to cheer her.

[.]
[..... καὶ ταῦτά σ' ἀμειβόμεν ἔγω·
['Νῆ θεῶν ἔγω σοι τόδ' ὁμῶ]μοκα,
[ὥς οὐδ' αὐτα πόλλαις, ἀ]λλ' ἴαν ἤχον
5 [μόναν ἀπ τῷ Δίος τὰν] παρθενίαν,
[ἔμωσ δ' οὐκ ὀδδον] ὠρρώδων ὑπὲρ ὅν
[ἀπύ μοι F ἐπέσκ]ηψ' Ἥρα βάλεσθαι.
[ταῦτ' ἔγω σ' ἤ]ὑφραν' ἄρ', ὥξυβόων
δ'.
['Ἄμμι μὰν,] πάρθεν', ἀ νύξ οὐχὶ
βάρυ
10 [φαίνεται]' ἔμμεν· ὥστ' οὐ μὴ σύ γ'
ἀτύξη.

A small part of the latter half of six more lines is extant, but I have been able to find no clue to the reading of them. In l. 6 the MS. probably had *οδον*. In l. 7 *Ἥρα* shows *ἄ* in the Nominative; cf. *ῶρα* (sic) Theocr. 30, and Hoffmann *Gr. Dial.* II. p. 529. With *ὥξυβόων* (Imperfect) in l. 8 cf. IV. 19 above. In l. 10 the MS. must have had *εφαίνεται*. There is a colon after the last word. The metre is that of VI. Translate:

. . . And I answered you, 'I swear to you by the Goddess that although I, like you, had of Zeus but one virginity, nevertheless I feared not the threshold beyond which Hera had bidden me cast it away.' Aye, thus I heartened you, and cried aloud, 'That night was sweet enough to me, neither have you, dear maid, anything to fear.'

An un mutilated piece twenty lines long still awaits decipherment on the verso of IV. When at my request Dr. Schubart in 1909 sent me a photograph, he said in the accompanying letter that he believed that all that looked at first sight like writing was merely the poem on the other side showing through. By putting a tracing of IV. behind the photograph in question I have proved that this is not so. The vertical line drawn to show the scribe where to begin his lines is perfectly clear, and at more than one place where the line on the verso is short and so does not obscure the view, notably at the spot corresponding to the end of l. 17 (*ιμέρω*), there are obvious vestiges

of letters. It is tantalising, but with no clear part to give a clue I hardly think anything will be made of the poem unless the writing can be made clearer by a re-agent. This has already been tried with great success in the case of the other fragments treated in this paper (compare the version of 1902 with that of 1907). Probably the re-agent was at the same time applied to this. But if not, it should be done

without delay, and then photographed. It should be remembered that the camera can often see more than the eye.

My thanks are due to Mr. G. Braunscholtz, of Manchester University, for most kindly reporting on the MS. when he visited Berlin some years ago.

J. M. EDMONDS.

Jesus College, Cambridge.

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

V.

H. Dem. 476:

καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια καλὰ,
σεμνά, τά τ' οὐ πως ἔστι παρεξ[ίμ]εν [οὔτε
πυθέσθαι,]
οὔτ' ὀχέειν· μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν σέβας
ἰσχάνει αὐδὴν.

In 1896 I recommended with a reservation Ruhnken's *παρεξέμεν*, and suggested *οὔτε κοεῖν* for the corrupt *οὔτ', ὀχέειν*. First note that after 476 I have with nearly every editor deliberately omitted the line:

Τριπτολέμῳ τε Πολυξείνῳ τ', ἐπὶ τοῖς δὲ
Διοκλεῖ,

so gratuitously foolish after 474:

δείξε, Τριπτολέμῳ τε Διοκλεῖ τε πλη-
ξίππῳ (read *δείξεν*),

to say nothing of its metrical deficiencies in the last four words. Allen and Sikes with their usual lack of judgment accept the line, and try to find a rag of justification for it by reading *πᾶσι(ν)* with Pausanias for the *καλὰ* of M. They also say with similar wisdom that *σεμνά* after *καλὰ* 'would be very awkward.' Homer did not know this, as we may see from E 731, Ω 644-5 and *passim*.

I can now proceed to the emendation or, as I hope, restoration of this admittedly difficult and most unsatisfactory passage. I would read it thus:

καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια καλὰ,
σεμνά, τά τ' οὐ πως ἔστι παρέξ ἐνέποντι
πυθέσθαι
οὔτ' ὀχέειν· μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν ἄγος
ἰσχάνει αὐδὴν.

In the last line *ἄγος* is Valckenaer's reading for *ἄχος*. Cobet proposed *σέβας*, but not only is this, being only subjective, much weaker as a taboo than *ἄγος*, for which cf. Aesch. *Sept. c. Theb.* 1017

ἄγος δὲ καὶ θανῶν κεκτῆσεται
θεῶν πατρώων,

but there seems to be hardly room enough for *σέβας* in the MS. Certainly the detection of *σ . . . σ M* is quite uncertain and probably wrong, for this reason: *σέβας* could never have given rise to *ἄχος*, but it is easy to see that the mutual action and reaction of *ἄγος* and *ὀχέειν* might easily result in the wonderfully exact but meaningless assonance *ὀχέειν* and *ἄχος* presented by the tradition.

The translation of my emended text would be to this effect: 'and she (Demeter) showed her fair and solemn mysteries which one flippant in speech may by no means hear or perform, for a heavy divine taboo checks their telling.'

These holy ceremonial rites must not even be spoken of in the presence of a mocker, a man who flouts and misrepresents sacred things, an Alcibiades for example, nor must such a one take part in their performance. For *παρέξ ἐνέποντι* cf. δ 348, ρ 139 *παρέξ εἵποιμι παρακλιδόν*, ψ 16 *παρέξ ἐρέουσα*, and Zeus himself in merry mood taunting Here Δ 6 *παραβλήδην ἀγορεύων*.

Little difficulty in understanding *ὄργια ὀχέειν* can be felt by those who have hitherto professed to be satisfied

with *ὄργια παρεξίμεν* (Matthiae). Allen and Sikes say it must mean 'transgress,' 'overstep,' but it seems to me now, as in 1896, that transgressing or overstepping mysteries needs a little elucidation. With *ὄργια ὀχέειν* we may compare not only Aesch. *Prom.* 143 *φρουρὰν ὀχέειν* but the more exact and satisfactory early epic *νηπιῖδας ὀχέειν* (*Odys.* i. 297) 'to play childish games.'

No childish game is more in vogue in all ages of the world than dancing, and that this was an important feature in Demeter's mysteries we know from the later expression *ἐξορχεῖσθαι τὰ μυστήρια*, 'to mimic and burlesque the mysteries' (*Luc. Pisc.* 33, *Salt.* 15).

The congruity of *ἐνέποντι* and the clause *μέγα—αὐδὴν* is another confirmatory point so far as the meaning goes. Horace in this very connection contrasts silence and babbling along with their issues. *O.I.* iii. 2. 25:

Est et fideli tuta silentio
Merces: vetabo, qui Cereris sacrum
Vulgarit arcanæ, sub isdem
Sic trabibus fragilemve mecum
Solvat phaselon; saepe Diespiter
Neglectus incesto addidit integrum.

While the actual deviation from the tradition involved in my conjecture, *ἐνέποντι* is in any case but small, I am clearly of opinion that a closer examination of our sole authority, the Moscow MS., here unfortunately much damaged and over-written by a later hand (*m*), reveals the possibility, or I might say the probability, that the reading given by the first hand was this very *ἐνέποντι*.

After *παρέξ* there is a slight interval, then a small triangular hole in the paper touching the top of a letter *ι* (*m*), but which may have been *ε* before the hole was made. Next in the faint ink of *M* comes *ν*, with a touch in the black ink of *m* on the top at the left-hand side of the letter, as if he had begun to retrace and ink it over, but had stopped, thinking the letter plain enough already, which it is. A little forward above the line *εν* (*M*) appears. Now we reach the critical point: *έποντι*, if we may suppose it originally stood here, or whatever it was, has been rendered illegible mainly by *m*'s overwriting. *M*'s accent over the supposed *ε* is plain enough; but for the rest *m* has written

a large *π* over the *π*, and then starting below the line has again written *πεν*: in the last stroke of the *ν* and after it *τι* in the old ink (*M*) is just legible.

From all this I venture to say that there is fair reason to think that my suggestion *ἐνέποντι* is more in conformity with the showing of the MS. than any reading hitherto adopted.

H. Herm. 456:

νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὀλίγος περ ἔων κλυτὰ
μήδεα οἶσθα,
ἴξε, πῆπον, καὶ μῦθον ἐπαίνει πρεσβυ-
τέροισι.

One alteration I have made here *οἶσθα* (*M*) for *οἶδας*, which latter never occurs in the old epic with guarantee of metre. It is usually printed here and 467 *πάντ' εὖ οἶδας*, where *εὖ* is obviously right, and again *Od.* i. 337. On the other hand, in this Hymn 382, as in *Il.* i. 365, *Od.* iv. 465, xvii. 573, *οἶσθα* is a metrical necessity. The inference is obvious and inevitable. Anyone can draw it for himself.

In other respects the reading is that adopted by Mr. Allen in the *Bibliotheca Oxon. Hom. Op.*, vol. v. *Μῦθον* in 457 is Ruhnken's ingenious suggestion for *θυμὸν*, though it is wrong. The line is curiously but not hopelessly corrupt. The interpretations, however, offered (*v.* Allen and Sikes, *Note ad loc.*) are both curiously and hopelessly inadequate. They remind one irresistibly of the proverbial groping in a dark cellar at midnight to find a black cat which is not on the premises at all. Many eminent scholars unfortunately are addicted to this practice. In this line they may find a valuable warning. Gemoll has suggested *θυμῶν*, but no one except Mr. Allen has ever even touched the root of the evil, *ἐπαίνει*. Still he has not succeeded. His remedy, *θυμὸν ἐπαίνει*, is a metrical abomination for which he vainly tries to find justification.

The truth is that *ἐπαίνει* represents an adjective agreeing with *θυμὸν*. As soon as we realise even the possibility of this, we arrive without much difficulty at

θυμὸν ἀπηνέα.

We might imagine then that a line had been lost beginning with *κάτθεο*,

but there is a better way which will obviate any such necessity and give us the original line in its integrity. Let us turn to l. 255 *σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν ἴσχειν*. The poet here did not say *ἴξε* (*ἴσδε*) but *ἴσχε*, 'curb,' 'check,' and so we get our line restored:

ἴσχε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἀπηνέα πρεσβυτέροισι.

μένος for the weak *πέπον* needs little apology, we have just seen how in *H. Dem.* 477 *π* has been taken for *μ*, and here *μ* has been taken for *π*.

Hermes has been indignant and wrathful, not without cause. He has been *smacked*. The real reconciliation ordained by Zeus only begins here. Apollo makes this appeal with further persuasions, and Hermes answers it (in 466) in words which, unless this appeal had been made, would be meaningless,

*ἐθέλω δέ τοι ἥπιος εἶναι
βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισι. . . .*

A parallel corruption to the above may be found in the brief *Hymn to Hestia* XXIV. 4:

*ἔρχομαι τὸνδ' ἀνὰ οἶκον, ἐπέρχομαι θυμὸν
ἔχουσα,
σὺν Διὶ μητιόεντι.*

Many conjectures have been made *ἐνῆα*, *εὐφρονα*, *ἐπεργέα*, *ἐνεργέα*, *ἐπίφρονα*. I prefer *ἐπητία* or the converse of *ἀπηνέα*, *ἐπηνία*. *Ἑπαρτία*, though graphically closer, seems hardly respectful enough to Hestia.

H. Dem. 22:

*οὐδὲ τις ἀθανάτων οὐδὲ θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἤκουσεν φωνῆς, οὐδ' ἀγλῶκαρποι ἐλαΐαι.*

In l. 22 I think Hermann's *οὔτε* for the second *οὐδέ* is probably right, but this is a question of little moment. The latter half of l. 22 is almost universally regarded as corrupt. Only Allen and Sikes attempt its defence in a long note. If their defence be valid, it would clearly be useless to add any new suggestion to the numerous emendations proposed by various scholars from Ruhnken to Gemoll. In reality it is absolutely unconvincing and mistaken, but it is only fair to say that they themselves express some degree of doubt:

'if this view is thought untenable, we are thrown back on Ilgen's "*Ελαΐαι*.' Still the mischief is done, and we find in Allen's *Hom. Op.*, vol. v., in the *Bibliotheca Oxoniensis* *ἐλαΐαι* without note or qualification. In the Loeb Translation Mr. Evelyn-White rightly adds an asterisk.

The note objects that 'the conjectures err in introducing a person or persons (Demeter or the nymphs),' because 'the categories *ἀθάνατοι* and *θνητοὶ ἀνθρώποι* are exhaustive with the exception specified in 24,' Hecate. This is supposed to be severely logical, but is far from being even rational. What is said is this: 'None of the immortals heard her cry, not even her mother; Hecate and Eëlios alone heard her.'

There were two exceptions. Do the words 'not even her mother' make a third. Certainly not. They merely make the 'exhaustiveness' more absolute, subject of course to the two exceptions. Even the one person among the immortals who might be expected to hear the cry before anyone else, and who actually did hear the second cry, failed to hear the first. Messrs. Allen and Sikes have no idea of this, and proceed to say: 'Any title of Demeter is peculiarly out of place: she heard the second and louder cry 38, 39, which sets her in motion.' Really they seem to think Demeter was a tram-car.

Curiously enough this logical argument, ineffective here, would be sufficient of itself to refute the very extraordinary note in which its authors elaborately and solemnly essay to defend the genuineness of the absurd interpolation, 424:

*Παλλὰς τ' ἐγρεμάχη καὶ Ἄρτεμις
ἰοχέαιρα.*

That the Oceanids 'form a class apart from gods and men' may, or rather must, be admitted, but to put Pallas, Athene and Artemis into this class is frankly impossible.

As to *ἐλαΐαι* the line of defence is very surprising: 'The reading of *Μ ἐλαΐαι* runs counter to the usual notion of Greek poetical taste. This, however, is no reason for suspecting the text.' Some people might say that the clause is mere irrelevant foolishness,

and as such cannot escape suspicion. The view of our editors is that we have here the earliest instance of the Pathetic Fallacy. They proceed pompously: 'In late, especially Latin, poetry inanimate nature is often personified (e.g., Verg. *Ecl.* i. 38, x. 13, and many instances given by Forbiger). *We have to learn that the idea was earlier than has been supposed.*' The italics are mine.

The plain truth is that, so far from this being an example of the Pathetic Fallacy which is common enough in Homer, it is a *reductio ad absurdum* and flat denial of it. Take the instances given.

Ecl. i. 39:

Tityrus hinc aberat. Ipsae te, Tityre, pinus,
Ipsi te fontes, ipsa haec arbusta vocabant.

x. 13:

Illum etiam lauri, etiam flevire myricae.

There we have natural objects, trees, as here, exhibiting sense and sensibility, the Pathetic Fallacy; but suppose we introduce negatives into (1),

neque three times repeated like οὐδέ in the Hymn, where is the Pathetic Fallacy then? Gone, absolutely and entirely gone. How such a note as that I am criticising came to be written passes all understanding.

But having now cleared the ground I submit my suggestion, making use of the adjective αλαιοῖς known only from Hesychius: αλαιοῖς: ὁ παλαιός, ἄφρων, Αἰσχυλος (read ὡς παλαιός, 'like π'):

οὐδέ τις ἀθανάτων οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἤκουσεν φωνῆς οὐδ' Ἀγλαόκαρπος
ἀλαιοῖς.

'not even the Lady of the glorious harvest heard the distracted cry.'

Gemoll, whose strong point is not metre, offers:

ἤκουσεν φωνὴν θεῶς ἀγλαοκάρπου ἐλεινῆν.

But Demeter, not her daughter, is ἀγλαόκαρπος (v. l. 4), and in early epic ἐλεινῆν is certainly ἐλεεινῆν v. l. 284 (No. IV.).

T. L. AGAR.

EURIPIDES FURENS.

DR. MARGOLIOUTH has recently published a remarkable pamphlet,¹ in which he shows that by shuffling the letters of the third and fourth iambic lines of each of Euripides' plays it is possible to rearrange them into lines which bear some resemblance to verses and give an indication of the play's date. The writer also states, as though it were an established fact, that it was the habit of the tragic poets to sign their plays by introducing anagrams of their names into the first couplet of each, one line generally containing the names, the other instructions for reading the riddle.² This statement, in lack of demonstration, is open to doubt; if it can be substantiated, it ought to give, in some cases, important evidence as to authorship; and indeed, from the fact that the letters

forming the name Sophocles may be extracted from the first couplet of the *Rhesus*, it is argued that Sophocles was really the author of the play; though, as a matter of fact, other names—e.g. Euripides, Agathon, and Aristophanes—can be disinterred with equal ease.

Those who can recall the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, now happily relegated to the asylum of lost causes, will remember the stir that was created by Ignatius Donnelly's discovery of the 'great cryptogram.' The advantage of such studies is that with anagrams, as with statistics, you can prove anything; it is merely a matter of knowing what you want to find, and marking when you hit but not when you miss.

Before proceeding further, I must pay a sincere tribute to the inventor of the barbarously-styled 'chronograms' for the thoroughness of his work. The iambs which he ascribes to the

¹ *The Chronograms of the Euripidean Dramas.*

² Marg. *op. cit.* p. 6.

ingenuity of the most tragic of the poets are not, indeed, such as would be regarded with favour by any Sixth Form, but perhaps our standard is pedantic. They do seem, however, to correspond letter by letter with the original lines—or perhaps we should not call the opening of the prologues original, for the poet's procedure apparently was first to construct two barbarous couplets containing miscellaneous information, and then put them into decent verse, the hidden meaning of which should remain unsuspected for 2,300 years, their very roughness being designed to help the concealment. Some practical difficulties suggest themselves: a tragedian who did not write *currente calamo*, but took two or three years over a composition, might find at the end that his opening lines contained a wrong date, and must either rewrite the prefaces or compose new ones, which might necessitate some alterations in the body of the play, since the prologue contained a foreshadowing of the chief events. Even the former course is beset with difficulties; in an extreme case it might be necessary to change the name of the hero. We have no instance of this supreme sacrifice, but Dr. Margoliouth would have us believe that, for the purpose of getting the correct date in the *Hecuba*, Euripides, who presumably shrank from changing the name of Polydorus or the plot of the play, intentionally falsified his ancestry, making Hecuba, on whose history, till now, no shadow of scandal has fallen, the daughter of a Thracian prince.

Before dismissing the chronograms, I would call attention to one which has hitherto escaped notice. In turning over the pages of the *Hecuba* two lines caught my eye:

ὁρῶ σ', Ὀδυσσεῦ, δεξιὰν ὑφ' ἑλματος
κρύπτοντα χεῖρα, καὶ πρόσωπον ἔμπαλιν.

A careful examination unearthed from these the following anagram:

ὅπως ὀρύξας μάρπτε δρῦν· πόσ' ἄρ τινα;
'Ολυμπίων ἂφ' ἑκατὸν εἰκόσι δύο· ἔχεις;

'Dig like one uprooting an oak, and grip tight; about how many, then?
—From a hundred Olympic festivals

twenty-two; have you got it?' The number thus obtained, $100 - 22 =$ the 78th Olympiad; this disagrees, at first sight, with tradition, which places the *Hecuba* in Ol. 88; but at the end of the 78th Olympiad Euripides would be about fifteen years old, and though we can hardly believe that he wrote so well-finished a play at that age, there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that this particular speech was composed then, possibly as a school-exercise. He would be just at the age when children delight in composing or solving anagrams, a taste which most of us soon outgrow. Many years later he was struck by the precocious merits of this old composition, and incorporated it in the drama.

I shall turn now to what, for want of a better name, we may call the *Onomatograms*. As Dr. Margoliouth has given in his pamphlet no rules for extracting the hidden meaning from the first couplet, except the statement that 'usually the names occupy one line and the direction (i.e. for finding them) the other'—which is an exaggeration¹—we must make rules for ourselves.

Starting with the presumption that there are certain things which we should expect, *a priori*, to find, I have come to the conclusion that many indications of authorship, expressed not only in iambs but in other forms of verse, might reasonably be looked for. In my investigations I have been severely handicapped by an inborn lack of such ingenuity as an expert diviner requires. It is often easy to discover at a single glance a few significant words, or even a complete line, lurking in the rubbish-heap produced by breaking up a couple of current verses into small change; it is hard for anyone without special gifts to reconstruct the rest of the litter into intelligible shape. I must be content, then, to indicate some of the lines on which the work may be attempted, leaving acuter intelligences to carry it to a finish.

First, then, in many 'onomatic' couplets—by which I mean the first iambic couplets of plays, which contain

¹ The name of *Euripides* is contained in one line in only seven out of the nineteen plays.

indications of the author's name—the name of a tragedian may be easily discovered. Thus the letters of the name Sophocles can be picked out from the couplet of the *Rhesus*; so also may other names, as I have already noted. But this is not the case with all plays; e.g. the onomastic couplets of the following plays ascribed to Euripides do not contain his name at all: the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, *Hippolytus*, *Alcestis*, *Hercules Furens*, *Ion*, *Phoenissae* and *Orestes*. On the other hand, from the onomastic couplets of many plays we can extract several names alternatively—from the *Rhesus*, Euripides, Sophocles, Agathon, and Aristophanes; from the *Hecuba*, Euripides and Aeschylus; from the *Heraclidae*, Sophocles and Euripides. The same is the case with plays of the other tragedians. In the onomastic lines of the *Prometheus* and the *Septem* lie buried the fragments of Aeschylus and Euripides, and, if we judged by names only, either Sophocles or Euripides might have composed the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. I have quoted only a few instances out of many.

Finding that the search for names alone produced such perplexing results, I next considered whether the poet, realising this difficulty, would not take some less obvious way of identifying himself than by leaving his name, along with that of others, for anybody to read; and I thought it likely that he might insert instead some descriptive phrases or titles *φωναέντ' ἀσυνέτοισι*. I considered first the case of Euripides, the subtlest of the tragic poets, and imagined how he might glory in accepting some of the opprobrious terms and statements showered on him by Aristophanes and others. The best known of these is the insinuation that his mother was a greengrocer and that he inherited her tastes; the next most striking criticisms are the *ληκυθίων ἀπώλεσεν* of the *Frogs*, the accusations of atheism, and the insinuation that Cephisophon helped in the composition of his plays. Without going far, I have already discovered several illuminating references to these criticisms. Thus a complete anagram, probably composed by Euripides himself in jest, is contained in the onomastic couplet of the *Medea*:

Εἰθ' ὥφε·λ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτύσθαι
σκιάφος

Κόλλων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας.

which gives us

Κηφισοφῶν ἐσκεύασ' ἐδάμασ' οὐχ
ἀπλῶς·

ἀγάν' ἄθλα προὔτιμης· ἔσθι δ' ἄκλα-
γεν·

'Cephisophon faked this; he has conquered you not simply; you preferred the pleasant prizes, but recognise the cry which he uttered.' (ἐκλαγεν aorist of κλάζω).

Though the precise meaning is not at first sight so clear as we could wish, this onomatogram is definite enough to convince the most sceptical; but as additional testimony I will quote some instances of the allusive type to which I have already referred. These I have not yet had time to decipher completely, but I believe that it can be done by anyone possessing a moderate knowledge of Greek and an unlimited patience.

Thus the onomastic couplet of the *Rhesus*

ἐς καιρὸν ἦκει καίπερ ἀγγέλλων φόβον·
ἄνδρες γὰρ ἐς γῆν τήνδε ναυτίλῳ πλάτῃ

conceals the cryptic line

σκανδικοπώλης γῆν πρὸ γῆς ἐλαύνεται,

'the greengrocer is driven from land to land,' which, if it is a reference to the author's sojourn in Macedon, completely upsets all theories about the play's date. As an alternative, the words *ληκυθίων ἀπώλεσεν* may be extracted from the letters, and they also occur in the first couplets of the *Hippolytus* and *Medea*—the latter contains, too, the letters of καὶ τότε Φωκυλίδου, a proverbial expression for 'damned iteration.'

From the onomastic couplet of the *Hecuba*

ἦκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας
λιπών, ἴν' Αἴδης χωρὶς ᾤκισται θεῶν

we gather

σκανδικοπώλης εἰμὶ καθέων ἀκρός.

'I am a greengrocer and a downright atheist.'

I abandoned the further investigation of Euripides after extracting from the first couplet of the *Alcestis* the words

νήπιος εἰ ζητῶν—'You are a fool to look.'

Turning for a short time to Aeschylus again, I had an intuition that the Father of Tragedy might prefer a more dignified metre than the colloquial iambic, and from the first couplet of the *Septem contra Thebas* I quickly extracted a very fair hexameter—

Αἶσχυλος Εὐφορίωνος ἔπη ποίησε τάδ' ἀργαί.

'Aeschylus, the son of Euphorion, composed these useless hexameters.'

Taking the *Agamemnon*, I asked myself what is the most striking event in the early part of the play—obviously, I thought, we might expect a reference, literal or metaphorical, to the story of the beacon-fires, and this was at once discoverable. But the iambic couplet is shorter than the two hexameters, or the elegiac couplet, for which I was looking; so we should probably have to go beyond the limit and take in an extra foot from the third line. The right place to stop was indicated by the keyword *στέγαις*, implying *concealment*. Taking, therefore, the words

Θεοὺς μὲν αἰτῶ τῶνδ' ἀπαλλαγῆναι πόνων
φρουρᾶς ἐτείας μήκος, ἣν κοιμώμενος
στέγαις,

I obtained the anagram

φρυκτὸς ἔην· νεμεσῶν κόμων ἦν πάντα
σέσιγας·

ΜΑΡΤΟΛΙΟΤὸ ἐποίησ' αἵματοέντ' ἀδόλως.

(for the irregular perfect *σέσιγα* cf. the formation of *δέδουπα*, etc.).

Translation: 'I was a beacon-light;

envying my sport, lo, you have been silent about all. I, Margoliouth, have done bloody deeds without guile.'

Even the chronograms contain nothing more remarkable than this prophecy, which brings the present essay to a satisfactory conclusion.

My friend Mr. C. W. Brodribb, who has been working independently at the anagrams, sends me the following alternative conversions of the opening couplet of the *Agamemnon*:

τῶς ὄντα σ' ἀκήκο' ἀλλ' ἐν Ἀγαμέμνων
φράσω·

μὲν μυθοποιὸς ἐτεὸν ἦν Εὐριπίδης;

'Thus I have heard of your existence, but I Agamemnon will remark one thing: was there really a dramatist Euripides?' 'A remarkable piece of foresight on Aeschylus' part,' writes the discoverer, 'and intended to forestall any attempt to assign the *Agamemnon* to Euripides.' Alternatively, if a dactyl is admissible in the fourth foot, the first line may be read

ταῶς, σ' ἀκήκο' ἐνόιτ', ἀλλ' Ἀγαμέμνων
φράσω

'Peacock (coxcomb), I hear you are at the bottom of this, but, etc.'

Of late years we have often seen pictures which are just as good if you look at them upside down or sideways or even through the back of the canvas; apparently what some modern artists have done for painting, the ancient dramatists did for literature.

J. F. DOBSON.

The University, Bristol.

ON AN ALLEGED NEW FRAGMENT OF EPIMENIDES.

From a paper read before the Oxford Philological Society.

THE reconstruction of four hexameter lines as a fragment of Epimenides, which is the subject of Mr. Nicklin's paper in this *Review*, vol. xxx., pp. 33 sqq., 1916, is not free from difficulties. I give the lines here for convenience. Dr. Rendel Harris writes them thus:

Τύμβον ἐποίησαντο σέθεν, κύδιστε, μέ-
γιστε,
Κρήτες αἰὲ ψευδεῖς, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες
ἀργαί·

ἀλλὰ σύ γ' οὐ θνήσκεις, ἔστηκας γὰρ ζῶος
αἰεῖ,
ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινύμεθ' ἡδὲ καὶ
ἐσμέν.

Mr. Cook writes them thus, and his version is preferable:

Σοὶ μὲν ἐτεκτῆναντο τάφον, πανυπέρτατε
δαῖμον,
Κρήτες αἰὲ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες
ἀργαί·

ἄλλα γὰρ οὐ σὺ θάνες, ζῶεις δὲ καὶ
ἴστασαι αἰεὶ,
ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινεόμεσθα καὶ
εἰμέν.

Both these attempts are modelled upon Callimachus, *Hymn to Zeus*, 6:

Ζεῦ, σὲ μὲν Ἰδαίοισιν ἐν οὔρεσσι φασὶ
γενέσθαι,
Ζεῦ, σὲ δ' ἐν Ἀρκαδίῃ πότεροι, πάτερ,
ἐφεύσαντο;
Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύσται· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ
ἄνα, σείω
Κρήτες ἐτεκτίναντο· σὺ δ' οὐ θάνες, ἐσσι
γὰρ αἰεὶ.

But suspicion arises at once, when one considers the amount of pseud-epigraphic writings which is known to have existed in the first century A.D., attached to great names in philosophy and morals; for instance, the *Χρυσῶν Ἐπιφ* of Pythagoras, the pseud-Orphica, the pseudo-Phocylidea, the pseud-Epicharmeia from *Oxyrhynchus*. Again, we should have expected that Plato, who mentions Epimenides twice in the *Laws*, would have also mentioned him at the beginning of Book I., where the Cretan institutions are described, had he written on Cretan institutions; but he does not. Again, what Greek could have used the philosophic phrase ἐν σοὶ ζῶμεν at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.? Lastly, we may add, as Dr. Farnell has pointed out to me, how could Epimenides have spoken of his contemporaries in such disparaging terms? I will deal first with the works attributed to Epimenides, of which the names and the fragments are given in Diel's *Fragmenta Pre-Socraticorum*.

1. The Testimony to Epimenides in Diog. Laert. I. 111. is astounding: Ἐποίησε Κουρήτων καὶ Κορυβάντων γένεσιν καὶ Θεογονίαν, ἔπη πεντακισχίλια, Ἀργοῦς ναυπηγίαν τε καὶ Ἰάσονος εἰς Κόλχους ἀπόπλουν, ἔπη ἑξακισχίλια πεντήκοντα, συνέγραψε δὲ καὶ καταλογάδην περὶ Θυσίων καὶ τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ πολιτείας καὶ περὶ Μίνω καὶ Ραδαμάνθους εἰς ἔπη τετρακισχίλια.

The total of these numbers is 15,000 ἔπη, which is only 193 lines short of the whole of the *Iliad*. After this, it is not surprising to find Diogenes also say that the length of Epimenides' life was

154 years, according to Phlegon *Περὶ Μακροβίων*; and considering the reputation of the Cretans, it is still less surprising to find that they gave him 300 years lacking one: an instance of circumstantiality which marks the accomplished raconteur or romancer. Hiller, in *Rhein. Mus.* 33. 525 sqq., has pointed out two things: that these, being round numbers, are most suspicious; and that many others of the early philosophers and sages have immense works attributed to them in Diogenes Laertius: thus Solon is said to have left 5,000 ἔπη, Periander 2,000, Cleobulus 3,000. Similarly in Suidas, Thamyris has 3,000 ἔπη attributed to him, Palaephatus many thousands, and so Arion, Aristaeas, Eumolpus and others (Birt, *Ant. Buch.*, gives a list, p. 166-168).

Hiller catches out Diogenes very neatly in his statement about Solon. Diogenes says that Solon left 5,000 ἔπη and ἰάμβους καὶ ἐπιδόους: then, Hiller asks, why are the ἰάμβοι and ἐπιδόοι not included in the number of these 5,000 ἔπη? Some have thought that ἔπη may = στίχοι, the numeration of lines in prose, a use of ἔπη which Birt, in *Ant. Buch.* 204, shows to be legitimate. But that raises a greater difficulty than ever; for how could prose have been written to that extent in those early days?

Suidas is more cautious in his statement on Epimenides: ἔγραψε πολλὰ ἐπικῶς καὶ καταλογάδην μυστήριά τινα καὶ καθαρμούς καὶ ἄλλα αἰνιγματώδη.

But we have a much earlier, though fragmentary, piece of testimony, in which the truth peeps out. The philosopher Philodemus, writing in the middle of the first century B.C., had these words in his *De Pietate* (Gomperz, p. 19), ἐν τοῖς εἰς Ἐπιμενίδην, where ἀναφερομένοις is rightly supplied. This shows that there were writings in existence before that time, not by, but attributed to, Epimenides. Nor was this the only doubt that was cast upon his writings. Demetrius of Magnesia, another contemporary of Cicero, and a friend of him and Atticus, judged that Epimenides' Letter to Solon, in which he described the constitution which Minos gave to the Cretans, was not

genuine, because it was written in the Attic dialect, and, what was more, the new Attic; Diog. Laert. I. 122: *διελέγχειν πειράται τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς νεαράν καὶ μὴ τῇ Κρητικῇ φωνῇ γεγραμμένην*, 'Ατθίδι δὲ, καὶ ταύτῃ νέα.

That all the poems attributed to Epimenides were spurious has lately been maintained by the Belgian scholar Demoulin; and W. Crönert in *Χάριτες*, a Genethliacon to F. Leo on his seventy-fifth birthday in 1911, maintains that Lobon of Argos wrote them. This Lobon was probably an early contemporary of Callimachus, and he is referred to in Diogenes under Thales and Epimenides. But all the evidence goes to show that Lobon was a writer only on a small scale—for instance, of a poem under the name of *Cleobulus*; and that he was not so much a forger, a 'falsarius impudens,' as Crönert and Susemihl call him, as a *Πινακογράφος*, one who drew up lists of authors and their works, and one too of a quite uncritical mind. These large numbers in Diogenes seem to be due not so much to Lobon's invention, as to the source from which he drew, probably Cretan. So these works ought probably to be called anonymous pseud-epigrapha, or pseud-Epimenidea at the most.

2. Secondly, the phrase *ἐν σοὶ ζῶμεν*. Now there is a certain similarity in a phrase of Sophocles, *Oed. R.*, 314, *ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἐσμέν*: but the meaning of that is 'we are in your hands, in your power, we depend on you': but here the meaning is mystical, as the following words show; and the resemblance is not more than verbal, just as in Eur. *Alc.* 278, *ἐν σοὶ δ' ἐσμέν καὶ ζῆν καὶ μή*, and Dem. *de Cor.* 193, *ἐν γὰρ τῷ θεῷ τοῦτο τὸ τέλος ἦν, οὐκ ἐν ἐμοί*. One thought at first that it might be connected with such phrases in the New Testament as *ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ*, and that the lines therefore might be regarded as of the Christian era. But another explanation has been given me by Dr. Farnell. Here we have a quasi-physical Pantheistic doctrine, derived ultimately from Ionian philosophy, formulated by Euripides and developed by the Stoics, that Zeus was the *αἰθήρ* which is all around us, and in which we live and move and have our being.

Aeschylus had said something like it in the *Heliades*:

Ζεὺς ἐστὶν αἰθήρ, Ζεὺς δὲ γῆ, Ζεὺς δ' οὐρανός.

Ζεὺς τοι τὰ πάντα, χῶτι τῶνδ' ὑπέρτερον.

Euripides has:

Ἄλλ' αἰθήρ τίκτει σε, κόρα,
Ζεὺς δὲ ἀνθρώποισιν ὀνομάζεται,

(Frag. 869, cf. Frag. 935); and a passage from his contemporary, Diogenes of Apollonia, contains language still more like that under discussion. In the longest fragment, 5, he speaks thus of *Ἄηρ*: *αὐτὸ γὰρ μοι τοῦτο θεὸς δοκεῖ εἶναι* [so Usener for *ἔθος δοκεῖ*]; and further on, *πάντα τῷ αὐτῷ ζῆν, καὶ ὀρᾶ, καὶ ἀκούει, καὶ τὴν νόησιν ἔχει ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πάντα*: So Pacuvius 86 (Frag. 36 in Diehl, *Poet. Rom. Vet. Reliquiae*, p. 52). It is indeed quite likely that St. Paul's favourite phrases *ἐν Θεῷ* and *ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι* may be partly due to Stoic physical philosophy. But the Pantheistic or mystical use of *ἐν* is too early for Epimenides.

But what is the relation of the alleged fragment to the lines in Callimachus? The pseud-Epimenidean work called *τὰ Κρητικά* and mentioned in Diodorus, V. 80, and thought by Diels and Neustadt to be in prose, appears to have been a collection of local Cretan legends. Now Callimachus is fond of giving obscure local legends, as for instance in the long fragments of the *Αἴτια*, lately published in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* VII. and XI., where legends of the islands of Ceos and Icus are given. The *Αἴτια* was full of such legends. Callimachus might well have drawn his information from this Cretan collection; and this seems more probable than that the author of the *Cretica* drew upon Callimachus: (Professor Margoliouth has made another suggestion, which I give below): Jerome twice takes the same view; after stating that the line *Κρήτες αἰεὶ κ.τ.λ.* occurred in Epimenides' *Oracula*, he goes on: 'heroici hemistichium postea Callimachus usurpavit' (Ep. 70. 2; I. 666 Migne); and VII. 707 Migne: 'Integer versus de Epimenide poeta ab Apostolo sumptus est' (and so Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I. 59), 'et

ejus Callimachus in suo poemate est usus exordio; sive vulgare, quo Cretenses fallaces appellabantur, sive [Migne has *sine* by a misprint] furto alieno operis in metrum rettulit.'

I cannot enter here on the question whether the *Χρησμοί* or the *Μίνως* was the origin of the words in the Syriac commentaries; but surely Mr. Nicklin cannot be right in his forced repunctuation of Diogenes Laertius, by which he would show that the *Μίνως ἢ Παδάμανθος* was written in verse. The order of the words seems quite decisive against him, and in favour of Gressmann. Nor can I here try to trace to which work the several fragments belong (see Diel, *Frag. Pre-Socr.* p. 193). But who was the Cretan poet regarded by them as a prophet, 'who was thought by some to be Maxenidus'? (Ishodad on *Titus* i. 12). 'It is a confusion with the letters that make Epimenides,' says Dr. Rendel Harris; but I am bound to say that two eminent Syriac scholars in Oxford, whom I consulted, cannot see any great resemblance between this word and Epimenides when written in Syriac. But Professor Margoliouth has made an interesting suggestion. Finding that the MS. of Ishodad which he possesses gives the name as *MKSNNIDUS*, he conjectures from Clement, *Protrept.* II. 37, *Ζήτει σου τὸν Δία . . . ὁ Κρήσ σοι διηγῆσεται, παρ' ᾧ καὶ τέθαιπται· Καλλιμαχὸς ἐν Ὑμνοῖς· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ᾧ ἄνα, σείο Κρήτες ἐτεκτῆναντο· τέθνηκε γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς*, that the name is a corruption

of the words *μαχος ἐν ὕμνοις*, *μαχος* being mutilated from *Καλλιμάχος*. He also suggests that Callimachus, who appears to be the oldest authority for the story, may have got it from Euhemerus; a view which receives strong support from Cicero, *De Nat. Deor.* I. 119, 'Ab Euhemero autem et mortes et sepulturae demonstrantur deorum'; and that the account of the wounding of Zeus by the boar, for which this Syriac commentary is apparently the only authority, was a confusion with the myth of Adonis; and that the statements of the Syriac writers are of post-Clementine origin. He also thinks that it is certain from Clement, *Strom.* I. xix. 91, that he cannot have known the lines attributed to Minos; for in quoting Acts xvii. 22-28 he mentions Aratus only. I must leave this question to those who have studied the relations between the Syrian and the Greek theologians. But I may perhaps be allowed to express a doubt whether these quotations ought to be written back into hexameters at all, even as pseud-epigrapha. This raises a wider question; and I only set out to show that the position of Dr. Rendel Harris and Mr. Nicklin is difficult to maintain, and that the lines which they have printed are not a genuine fragment of the philosopher Epimenides.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College,
Oxford.

ON TRAJECTION OF WORDS OR HYPERBATON.

INTELLIGENCES trained from the outset to regard the succession of words as the ultimate arbiter of their construction, to expect the subject to precede its verb and the object to follow it, to tie the prepositional phrases which now do duty for cases to the words that they define or determine, and to conform to all the other rigid conventions of expression which an absence or a paucity of inflexions involves, and by this training of necessity habituated to view order as the basis of syntax, receive from such a line as that of Lucan VIII.

343 'ab *Hyrcanis* Indoque a litore *siluis*¹ a severe but wholesome shock. How desperately this shock is resented the attempts at its emendation show: *Phasis* Withof and *uisos* Schrader for *siluis*,

¹ Like Professor Conway in his article 'On the Interweaving of Words with Pairs of Parallel Phrases,' *Classical Review*, xiv. (1900) pp. 357 sqq., I use italics to show the correspondences of the words in question, not the punctuation marks employed by Madvig *Adversaria* 2 p. 71 and others after him, with their misleading modern associations. The effect of such marks is not to reunite the separated words but to disjoin the rest.

Indorum limite for *Indoque a litore* Burman. Exact parallels to our disturbing passage may be found in Ovid *Met.* 8. 9 'inter honoratos medioque in uertice canos,' Manilius 1. 429 'discordes uultu permixtaque corpora partus' (with Housman's note), and again in Lucan 5. 800 'fertur ad acquoreas et se prosternit harenas.'

Collections of such dislocations of order have been made at various times.¹ But no classification, so far as I know, has been attempted. I propose therefore to state briefly the conditions or restrictions to which they appear in general to conform.

In doing so I shall not take account of arrangements of words in single sentences, such as the separation of connected words or the inversion of the members in pairs of corresponding words (chiasmus), that we find strange but which are an integral part of the rhetorical machinery of Latin speech, although such arrangements are sometimes included under Hyperbaton.² Further I shall for the most part deal with trajections by which a word or word-group is moved not merely from the place but also from the clause or sentence where we expect to find it.

i. The prime condition of hyperbaton is this: that to a mind accustomed to regard the import of inflexions and to consider sentences as wholes, the construction, and therefore the sense as determined by the construction, must be obvious, or, in other words, there must be no real ambiguity. If this is not the case, as it would seem to be in an insignificant minority of instances, the liberty of trajection has been abused.

Within single sentences we may next note as specially disturbing to our notions of propriety

ii. The appearance of prepositions at some distance from their cases.³—Copa 4 'ad cubitum raucos excutientis calamos,'

¹ E.g. Professor Housman has several copious ones in his notes on Manilius and elsewhere.

² E.g. in Kühner's *Lateinische Grammatik*, ed. Stegmann, vol. ii., pt. 2, pp. 618 sqq.

³ Their immediate postposition as in Lucr. 1. 841 'ignibus ex' is a different matter and does not concern us here.

Ovid *Met.* 2. 524 'Argolica quod in ante Phoronide fecit' for *ante in* or *Phoronide*

ante, Prop. 3. 4. 18 'et subter captos arma sedere duces' but not Prop. 3. 1. 4, as some think, because of *i*. It may be noted that in these trajections the limitation of *vi.* (below) is generally observed.

iii. Copulating and contrasting conjunctions introducing coordinated sentences may be postponed.—This is so common that it excites no surprise, except with *que* or *ue* whose enclitic character and the accident that in Latin texts they are printed as an appendage to the preceding word make the licence appear greater than in the case of *et* or *aut*. How frequent, for metrical convenience, is this postponement in the pentameters of Tibullus and Ovid we are all aware.

iv. Relatives and conjunctions introducing accessory or subordinated sentences may be postponed.—This is common enough, even in prose, with certain conjunctions, especially *cum*. So also with *quod*, *si*, *ne*, *quoniam*, etc. The extent of postponement does not seem to matter, provided the main verb does not precede the conjunction. So the prose writers and, in general, the poets. An exception in Ovid *Her.* 3. 19 'si progressa forem caperer ne nocte timebam' where also *nocte* belongs to the *si* clause, Madvig l.c.

To come to connected clauses or sentences.

v. In ἀπὸ κοινοῦ constructions, such e.g. as we have in comparisons, a noun or verb may, contrary to expectation, appear in the subordinate instead of in the principal member of the expression.

Ov. *Her.* 12. 26 'quam pater est illi, tam mihi diues erat.' In Hor. *S.* 1. 3. 9 sq., a passage which I have already fully discussed in the *Classical Review*, xv. (1901) 303 'saepe uelut qui | currebat fugiens hostem,' *currebat* appears in the place of *currit*, i.e. 'saepe currebat uelut qui currit.'

vi. Adjacent single words or indivisible phrases may exchange places and so get just outside their own clauses or sentences. The frequent variation in the succession of words connected syntactically, as noun and attribute,

verb and object, doubtless facilitated this trajection.

Lucan 5. 321 '*hic fuge si belli finis placet ense relicto*,' i.e. '*fuge, hic ense relicto*,' 3. 679 '*hostilem cum torserit exeat hastam*,' 7. 685 sq. '*quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos tam misero Fortuna minor*,' 1. 14 '*hoc quem ciuiles hauserunt sanguine dextrae*.'

Hor. S. 1. 5. 72 '*paene macros arsit dum turdos uersat*,' 2. 1. 60 '*quisquis erit uitae scribam color*,' ib. 3. 211 '*Ajax immeritos cum occidit desipit agnos*,' Virg. *Aen.* 2. 303 sqq., '*arrectis auribus*

adsto | in-segetem ueluti cum flamma furentibus Austris | incidit . . . stupet inscius . . . pastor.' The sense requires '*adsto ueluti, in segetem cum, etc., stupet pastor*.' Lucretius 3. 843

'*et si iam nostro sentit de corpore postquam | distracta est*,' 5. 177 '*natus enim*

debet quicumque est uelle manere | in uita' and many other places, from amongst which I cite two I had explained by hyperbaton before I had formulated this limitation, Catullus 66.

77 sq. '*dum uirgo quondam fuit omnibus expers | unguentis*' (*Classical Philology* 3. 257 sqq.) and Ter. *Andr.* 971 sq.

'*num ille somniat | ea quae uigilans uoluit?*' (ib. 10. 263 sq.), *uigilans* belonging to *somniat*.

Within a sentence also the simple interchange of two words will often restore a normal order. So in Horace *carm.* 3. 4. 19 sq. '*ut premerer sacra*

| lauroque collataque myrto' and Tibullus 1. 1. 24 '*io messes et bona uina date*.' Allow the shift, and there is nothing remarkable in the reference of the attribute to both the nouns. So with a genitive Lucan 8. 367 sq. '*illic et laxas uestes et fluxa uirorum | uclamenta uidet*.'

The expression 'indivisible phrase' must be construed with some liberality. As examples take Horace S. 1. 10. 19

'*nil praeter Caluum et doctus-cantare*

Catullum' and Silius Italicus 11. 459 sqq. '*sed quos pulsabat Rhipaeum ad*

Strymona nerui | auditus-superis-auditus-monibus-Orpheus | emerito fulgent clara inter sidera caelo' where the phrase fills a whole line.

vii. Words which are obviously in close syntactical connexion may be moved still further apart if they occupy corresponding positions in the verse.

For the hexameter in addition to Lucan 8. 343 and the parallels already adduced see Manilius 1. 262 '*ut sit idem mundi primum quod continet arcem*,' Lucan 9. 232 sq. '*nam quis erit finis si nec Pharsalia pugnae | nec Pompeius erit*,' ib. 636 sq. is similar but easier '*hoc habet infelix cunctis impune Medusa | quod spectare licet*.'

For the pentameter see Catullus 66. 18 '*non ita me diui vera gemunt iuerint*,' Ovid *Tr.* 1. 8. 24 '*supremo dum licuitque die*,' id. *F.* 1. 263 sq. '*inde, uelut nunc est, per quem descenditis* (inquit) *| arduus in ualles et fora cliuius erat*.'

viii. Sometimes an obviously unfinished expression is interrupted by the interposition of a word or indivisible phrase.

Lucan 7. 33 '*tu velut-Ausonia uadis moriturus in urbe*,' ib. 797 sq. '*ac*

ne-laeta furens scelerum spectacula perdat | inuidet igne rogi miseris,' Statius *Theb.* 9. 135 sq. '*uidit quamquam undique crebrae | Hippomedon ante-oraminae*,' cf. Ovid *Met.* 4. 436 sq. '*noui que*

| qua-sit-iter, manes Stygiam quod ducat ad urbem, | ignorant.' This licence is in principle the same as Ennius's '*saxo cere comminuit brum*' which is perverse enough, but wholly clear of ambiguity.

The chief subject, if in the *nominative*, may be thus deferred. So in the hyperbaton which I have argued should be restored to Propertius 2. 32. 33 sqq., where the construction is somewhat complicated by an ἀπο κοινοῦ '*ipsa Venus quamuis corrupta libidine Martis | nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit | quamuis Ida Rhea pastorem dicat amasse | atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam*,' that is '*ipsa Venus . . . in caelo semper honesta fuit nec minus* (in c. s. *honesta fuit*)

Rhea quamuis Ida etc. *American Journal of Philology* 17 pp. 37 sqq.

ix. Lastly there are cases where words belonging grammatically to the latter of two connected sentences or words are placed in front of the former, for the sake of emphasis.—So in coordinated sentences Terence *Ad.* 917 'tu illas abi et traduce,' Manilius 4. 534 'se quisque et uiuit et effert.' In both cases a normal order would have been less effective. In Lucretius 3. 196 'namque papaueris aura potest suspensa leuisque | cogere ut ab summo tibi diffluat altus aceruus' *papaueris* has for the same reason been moved from the subordinate to the principal clause.

These are the chief points observable in the treatment of hyperbaton by Latin poets; and in the consideration of particular instances they ought none of them to be excluded from our view. The same passage may combine more than one kind of displacement as several of the examples already given will show; and the explanation of any single displacement need not necessarily be single. The order adopted by the writer may be dictated by more than one consideration. The analysis of particular passages must be left to the student. But two of the harsher hyperbata may with advantage be examined here.

Juvenal 3. 309:

qua fornace graues, qua non incude catenae?

This verse is a rearrangement of 'qua fornace, qua incude non catenae graues?' *Non* has been moved in front of *incude* (vi.) and *graues* has been placed in the first half of the hexameter so as to correspond with *catenae* (vii.). Apropos of Juvenal the hyperbaton propounded with some hesitation by Mr. Housman at 4. 115 sq. 'caecus adulator dirusque a ponte satelles dignus Avicinos qui mendicaret ad axes' will be a case where vi. has been at work to move *a ponte*, already mentally figured as in front of the *dignus qui* clause, still further from *mendicaret*.

The second passage, Lucretius 3. 992 sqq., is one on which I and others have wasted our pains:

sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem
quem uolucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
aut alia quauis scindunt cuppedine curae.

If *uolucres* means 'birds,' then *uolucres* is corrupt, because in 984 Lucretius has said '*nec Tityon uolucres ineunt Acherunte iacentem*' and if birds do not tear the giant, still less do they tear the lover. But *uolucres* does not mean 'birds'; it is the adjective epithet of *curae*, as *anxius* is that of *angor*. Says Lucretius 'There is no Tityos prostrate in Acheron and devoured by birds of prey. The real Tityos is the man with us who is prostrated by love or other passions'—for 'in amore iacentem' compare Tibullus 2. 5. 109 sqq. 'et mihi praecipue, iaceo cum saucius annum | et (saueo morbo cum iuuat ipse dolor) usque cano Nemesim'—'and whose breast is torn by winged anxieties.' For the image in *uolucres* compare Hor. *carm.* 2. 16. 11 sq. '*curas laqueata circum | tecta uolantis*' and Theognis 729 sq. *φροντίδες ἀνθρώπων ἔλαχον πτερὰ ποικίλ' ἔχουσα | μυρόμεναι ψυχῆς εἵνεκα καὶ βίτου*. Lucretius has framed his sentence with great art; but comprehension has been thrown off the track by the addition of the clause *atque exest anxius angor* which, like those of which specimens are quoted under ix., has no effect upon the main construction 'quem uolucres curae in amore iacentem lacerant aut alia quauis scindunt cuppedine.' Neglecting the parenthetical insertion, *uolucres* and *curae* in the following line are seen to be in corresponding positions (vii.). Compare for their separation *raucis*—*cicadis* in Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 12 sq. 'at mecum raucis tua dum uestigia lustrō | sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.'

Of all the users or abusers of hyperbaton Ovid, true to the character which the elder Seneca *Rhet. Contr.* 2. 2. 12, gives of him, is, as Madvig *l. c.* and Munro on Lucr. 3. 843 have said, one of the most licentious. The sense however even with him is usually perspicuous, provided that the words are read¹ and not simply surveyed. So in *Am.* 3. 5. 11-14 'candidior niuibus tum

¹ 'Man darf auch eins nicht vergessen: der römische Dichter konnte auf ein Publikum von Hörern rechnen und ein sinngemässer Vortrag ist oft der beste Kommentar,' R. Hildebrandt, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Gedichtes Aetna*, p. 28.

cum cecidere recentes, | in liquidas nondum quas mora uertit aquas; | *candidior* quod adhuc spumis stridentibus albet | et modo siccata *lacte* reliquit ouem.' We may not unreasonably disapprove of the separation of *candidior* and *lacte*; but to call it an obscurity is to ignore the *candidior niubus* of the preceding couplet. Four lines further down

'atque iterum pasto ²*pascitur* ¹*ante* cibo' we have a licentious change in the meaning of the verb and a false chiasmus; but the sense is perfectly obvious to one who has read the '*renuocatas ruminat herbas*' of the previous line.

A word in conclusion on the causes or motives of hyperbaton. One of these is a reaching after *emphasis*. Examples of this have already been given and more might be added. Ovid *Ibis* 3 sq. 'nullaque *quae possit* scriptis tot milibus extat | littera Nasonis sanguinolenta legi' might have been '*nullaque Nasonis scriptis | extat littera quae possit*' but for the insistence of the writer. Thus

Horace marks the prominence of his *mea* in *Ep.* 2. 2. 20 sqq. 'dixi me pigrum proficiscenti tibi, dixi | talibus officiis prope mancum ne *mea* saeuus | iurgares ad te quod epistula nulla rediret.'

But the feeling for rhythm and regard to the balance of speech-groups had much to do with producing hyperbaton. In its milder forms trajection of words was recognised by the ancients themselves as a legitimate stylistic device, Cicero *Orator* 230, Quintilian *Inst.* 8. 6. 65; and Professor Conway has rightly drawn attention to this side of the matter in the paper already cited *Classical Review* l.c. p. 358a.

It may be added that here too Rome followed in the wake of Alexandria;

Callimachus *fragm.* 445 οὐδ' ὄθεν οἶδεν ὁδεύει θνητὸς ἀνὴρ, Theocritus 29. 3 κήγῳ μὲν τὰ φρενῶν ἐρέω κέαρ' ἐν μύχῳ.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool,
July 7, 1916.

SOME CRUCES IN VIRGIL RE-CONSIDERED.

Eclogue i. 69.

A PAPER by Mons. L. Havet in *Revue de Philologie*, vol. xxxviii. (1914), reopens the discussion of a classical difficulty. Meliboeus, resigning himself to exile, indicates the end of the earth by four points (Africa, Scythia, the Oaxes, Britain), and then adds a half-despairing hope of future repatriation:

en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite tecum,

69 post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor
aristas?

M. Havet begins by remarking that 'for Servius and all the ancients *aristas* means *messes*,' particularising Claudian. This is rather a misleading selection: if it were merely an opinion held by scholars who lived 400 years later than Virgil, it would not be of decisive, though still of considerable, importance. But it is clear from an imitation in *Troades* 76 that Seneca so understood Virgil:

et Sigeis trepidus campis
decumas secuit inessor aristas.

This passage also disposes of Conington's objection 'that *aliquot* would naturally distribute *aristas*, whereas the equivalent to *messes* is the plural *aristae*, not the singular *arista*.'

Seneca's authority is peculiar in literary questions which have to do with the Augustan writers, because of his father's extraordinary lifetime. Old Seneca was only about fifteen years junior to Virgil; he might have been familiar with the first, and any subsequent, editions of Virgil's works, and with the earliest generation of commentators. All this fund of firsthand information, recorded in his phenomenal memory, he represented to his sons.

I find it impossible to pass by Seneca's testimony in favour of *aristas* = *messes*. And this word once established in meaning, the weak point is defined. It is *aliquot*. *Aliquot aristas* 'several summers' is, as M. Havet (and others) have argued, a shocking bathos for Virgil. But I cannot sympathise with his opinion that *mirabor* is unmeaning.

Coupled (as only here in all Virgil) with a participle, it is clearly a Graecism 'see with surprise.' Why with surprise? Evidently because he has only a very faint hope that the wish expressed in *enumquam* will ever come true. His *regna* include the *patrios fines*, his father's boundaries, and the cottage. Will he ever see them again? What a glad surprise it will be!

That Heyne's construction of *post* as an adverb should have passed muster with so many editors is one of many proofs how carelessly the *Eclogues* have been read since the Germanic fashion of depreciating them in order to exalt Theocritus has obtained. The second phrase beginning with *post* is undoubtedly an epanaphora, with variation, of the *longo post tempore*: a characteristically Bucolic turn of expression and rhythm. What the epanaphora is I hope to show presently; *post* cannot make it, being the most unemphatic word of the phrase *longo post tempore*.

But M. Havet, rightly rejecting Heyne's interpretation, and (as I hold) wrongly finding fault with *mirabor*, is reduced to supposing an omitted verse, of which he sketches the outline thus (disclaiming at the same time any pretension to 'faire du Virgile':

*enumquam patrios longo post tempore fines
pauperis et tuguri congestum caespitem culmen
aspiciam? aut ego Hyperboreos flavescere sole
post aliquot, mea regna videns, mirabor aristas?*

Now this both uncouples *videns mirabor*, and retains Heyne's objectionable interpretation of *post* as an adverb. M. Havet allows that there is a *prima facie* improbability in supposing a line lost in the *Eclogues*, an improbability hardly palliated by the fact that in *Buc.* iv. 62 the right reading has only been preserved by Quintilian quoting it (and misquoting, at that, as the Quintilian MSS. give it) as an example of a figure of style. It is an axiom of this present paper that the text of the *Eclogues* is not beyond emendation; but why proceed to the much more strained hypothesis of a lacuna when, the vicious point being strictly located, emendation will serve our turn? For there is nothing else amiss but the bathos of *aliquot*. That bathos disappears if we read:

post ah quot mea regna videns mirabor aristas
'after oh how many summers shall I enjoy the astonishing (because unexpected, hardly hoped) sight of my domains?' For the 'interjectio dolentis vel execrantis' is emotionally adequate, and *post ah quot aristas* balances with *enumquam longo post tempore*.

Ecl. iii. 88.

In the match between Menalcas and Damoetas, Palaemon judging, there is one line which even the cautious Conington (Nettleship-Haverfield, 1898) was tempted to regard as corrupt. Benoist leaves it unintelligible after his explanation, and Plessis thinks Virgil intended it to be vague. With all deference to my friend's great authority in any point of Virgilian criticism, I must regard vagueness in a Latin poet as an almost certain symptom of corruption in the text.

I transcribe the eight lines 84-99:

D. Pollio amat nostram quamvis est rustica Musam:

Pierides, vitulam lectori pascite vestro.

M. Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina: pascite taurum,
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.

88 D. Qui te, Pollio, amat, veniat quo te quoque gaudet;
mella fluant illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum.

M. Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mevi:
atque idem iungat volpes et mulgeat hircos.

The whole passage has been variously judged in point of taste: that is not my present concern: whether artistically successful or not, it looks like an occasional courtly 'gag' introduced into the midst of the amoebean convention of themes, for the special glorification of an important personage. *Hic adulatur consulem*, as Servius and the Berne scholiasts remark. One may compare *Ecl.* vi. 1-12 and viii. 6-13; but in those the compliments look like afterthought pasted on to poems which lay already complete in his desk. It may be so here, too, but at least the let-in piece is neatly (though not inextricably) fitted. Be that as it may.

What is the meaning of *veniat quo te*

quoque gaudet? What is this goal to which Pollio's admirer is also to attain? 'The consulship,' says that same scholiast. Are, then, all Pollio's admirers to become consuls? A strange wish. And, even so, are 'flowing honey and spices growing on the brambles' the common perquisite of consuls? A strange notion. But there is no need to argue from impressions, when the very law of the amoebean exercise gives precision to the problem and directs the search for a solution. Good parrot-work is of the essence of the tuneful scrap between shepherds. Menalcas' retort would be a failure if he did not mimic adroitly the cast of Damoetas' challenge. Now Menalcas' couplet, roughly paraphrased, says 'Bavius and Mevius are birds of a feather: to Hell with the lovers of them both!' Damoetas' couplet must have said: 'Pollio and somebody else are birds of a feather. Paradise on earth for the lovers of them both!'

Omit the words *veniat quo*, as an experimental hypothesis, since they clearly refuse to fit such a scheme, and consider what is left standing:

qui te, Pollio, amat . . . te quoque gaudet.

If the line had survived thus, with a lacuna, would anybody have hesitated to affirm that this lacuna must be supplied with a proper name in the vocative? 'Who loves Pollio, rejoices also in So-and-So.' As Mevius is to Bavius, so is *x* to Pollio. Who is *x*? Firstly, the name to be supplied must account, in palaeographical probability, for the letters that the MSS. offer; secondly, it must be that of a personage—a political, not a literary, personage: for Pollio as a poet has been fully honoured in the two preceding couplets, and the Fourth *Eclogue* proves that it is to Pollio as statesman, not as poet, that the vision of the new Golden Age attaches. And, lastly, it must of course be a personage of Pollio's calibre and politically allied with him. If these indications are correctly surmised, the name to which they point is easily found:

qui te, Pollio, amat, MUNATI, te quoque gaudet.

L. Munatius Plancus, the accomplished trimmer, was consul in 42 B.C.,

and did not take sides with Antony till after the Perusine War. He was intimate with Pollio, though he broke with him afterwards. He played an analogous part to that of Pollio and Alfenus Varus in reinstating native owners who had been expropriated to make room for veteran planters, he at Lyons as they at Mantua.

This *Eclogue* admittedly dates between 42 and 40 B.C. Suppose MUNATI miswritten MUNIAT or MVNAT, and VENIAT is not an improbable recorruption: to which QUO will be complementary. The name had no such celebrity as Pollio's to safeguard it.

But there is another hypothesis: that the name was removed by Virgil himself, a poetical *damnatio memoriae* such as he inflicted on Nola and on Cornelius Gallus. However, though the name might be ill-sounding in 37 B.C., yet after Plancus' final reconciliation, and long before Virgil's death, it would apparently be unobjectionable again, especially in such a passing allusion. In this alternative hypothesis the palaeographical considerations of course fall out of count. And given the symmetrical necessity for a name in the vocative and the nonsense of the substitute, I prefer to believe in a corruption. Finally, it is important to remark that both Medicean and Palatine here are wanting: the text depends on nothing earlier than the Romanus.

Ecl. iii. 102.

This verse is read either:

his certe neque amor causa est: vix ossibus
haerent.

thus Conington, Nettleship, Plessis, following Voss and Heyne; or

hi certe—neque amor causa est—vix ossibus
haerent.

thus Madvig, Bénédict (in his note), and Hirtzel: *hi* is Stephanus' conjecture, which Heinsius accepted.

Aelius Donatus, commenting on Terence, *Eunuchus* 269,

Hisce hoc munere arbitrantur

Suam Thaidem esse

remarks:

hisce pro hi vetuste. *Vergilius*, *hisce certe neque amor*, etc.,

quia $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{hisce debebat } V^2 \\ \text{hice debebat } Hagen \\ \text{hicendebant } B \\ \text{hiscevolebant } TC \end{array} \right\} \text{dicere.}$

The value of this testimony has been strangely misappreciated, because critics have been so busy debating whether *his* for *hi* be a possible form of nominative for Virgil that they have blinkered themselves from seeing to the adjoining elements in the problem.

What does *vix ossibus haerent* mean? Ask the ancients first:

haerent id est movent (Philargyrius)
vix ossa eorum cohaerent (Servius).

Not much light here. The question remains, How can a lamb hang on to its bones?

Bénoist, seeing the difficulty, cites Grattius' *Cyneg.* 290, where (of a very tender pup) it is said:

teneris vix artubus haeret.

In this phrase *haeret* for *cohaeret* is not indefensible, just because the joints are the very instruments of cohesion. Bones do not keep a creature together any more than a creature hangs on its bones. Neither as dative nor ablative is *ossibus* reasonable. Nor is it agreeable to prevailing usage; for although Theocritus says (*Id.* iv. 15): *τῆρας μὲν δὴ τοι τὰς πόρτιος ἀντὰ λείπεται τῶστέα*, against this you may put the same author's *ὅστέ' ἔτ' ἥς καὶ δέρμα* ii. 89; and usually in Latin the phrase suits with our English phrase 'skin and bones' or 'a bag of bones':

reliquit ossa pelle amicta lurida

Hor. *Epod.* xvii. 22

per tenuem ossa < anuis > sunt numerata cutem

Prop. IV. v. 64

dura cutis per quam spectari viscera possunt;

ossa sub incurvis exstabant arida lumbis

Ovid *M.* viii. 803

vix habeo tenuem quae tegat ossa cutem

Trist. IV. vi. 40

membrisque cutis tegit ossa peresis

Sil. Ital. xiv. 604

ossaque nondum

adduxere cutem.

Lucan iv. 287.

Usage, then, suggests that a skin would improve matters.

Now to return to Donatus. What he tells us is not that Virgil uses *his* for *hi*, but *hisce* for some other form which the MSS. leave uncertain; it may have been *hi* or *his* or *hice*. *Hisce* alone is sure. Combine this datum with the

material difficulty of keeping bones together without a skin, and the usual collocation of *cutis* with *ossa* in similar phrases, and the three points are reconcilable in one same solution.

Virgil wrote:

HISCE CVTES (nec amor causa est) vix ossibus haerent,

that is to say, *hisce agnis*.

Despite the prescription of 350 years and the prestige of Heinsius, I fail to see any palaeographical probability in favour of *hi*. How *HISCECVTES* would first by haplography become *HISCETES* and then, to make sense (of a sort), *HIS CERTE*, is obvious enough. I say 'of a sort,' for would not a strict Latinity require *his quidem* and not *his certe* if the meaning were what it is usually taken to be?

If the scholiast did say that *hisce* was used by Virgil as a nominative, he was mistaken in this; but it does not follow that he was mistaken in saying that the form *hisce* was in Virgil. In fact it is doubtful whether he meant anything more than that in this one place Virgil used a form with the suffix *-ce*, viz. in the dative plural *hisce* for *his*.

Ecl. iv. 61.

matri P ¹ R matris P ² γ	} longa decem	tulerunt P ² R Serv. et Ael. Donat. tulerum P tulerint P ¹ ? Bern. 165, deli tulerant, Bern. 184 abstulerint pro v.l. Serv.	} fastidia menses.

Lejay's excellent article in *Revue de Philologie* has done much for the éclaircissement of the difficulties in this poem which Messrs. Mayor, W. Fowler, and Conway had left outstanding. Conington erred deplorably in the last four lines. To begin with, the reading

qui non risere parentes

may be regarded as almost an acquired certainty: the notion that *videre* with an accusative was at best archaic Latin, or vulgar Latin, may be finally dispelled by a comparison of Horace *Epist.* I. xiv. 39, *Od.* I. x. 9-12, *Lydia* 5 (= *Dirae* 108), *Stat. Silv.* III. i. 151. But still for the complete understanding of this old wives' jingle which Virgil

borrowed from the Italian Mrs. Gamp to finish off his 'chant du premier sourire' (as Lejay so well calls it), there remain the crucial questions of reading in this verse 61.

1. What does *ferre fastidia* mean? Servius' variant *abstulerint* indicates an ancient scruple here; and there is good reason for scruple. Conington's note runs '*longa fastidia* i. f. *taedia*. *Fastidium ferre* and *adferre* occur elsewhere, Quint. v. 14, Cic. Mur. ix. 21.'

This misses the idiom of *fastidia ferre*, a phrase which, I maintain, is indissoluble. The two expressions are anything but interchangeable: *adfero fastidium* or *fastidia* means 'I produce boredom'; '*fero fastidium* (or—*a*)' means 'I am slighted, or scorned, bored, sickened, put upon.'

Cicero has *ferre fastidium* only once: *quorum non possem ferre fastidium* (Phil. x. 18).

Conington's passage from *pro Murena* is not *ferre* but *adferre*: Clark's text records no variant:

primum ista nostra adsiduitas, Servi, nescis quantum interdum *adferat* hominibus *fastidi*, quantum satietatis (ix. 21).

So that fails. His other example, Quint. Inst. v. 14-30, is more dubious:

locuples et speciosa vult esse eloquentia: quorum nihil consequetur, si conclusionibus certis et crebris et in unam prope formam cadentibus concisa et contemptum ex humilitate et odium ex quadam servitute et ex copia satietatem et ex similitudine *fastidium tulerit*.

Since Quintilian has elsewhere *contemptum adferre* (iii. 7-19), *odium adferre* (xi. 2-41), and *fastidium adferre* (xi. i. 15), I should not hesitate to emend him here, where the three phrases are harnessed in a zeugma, to read:

fastidium adtulerit.

Conington's two alleged instances failing, are there any others?

I know of only one: in Valerius Flaccus' account of the Harpies pestering Phineus:

flagrat acerbis odor patrique expirat Averni halitus; unum omnes incessere planctibus, unum infestare manus: inhiat Cocytia nubes luxurians ipsoque *ferens fastidia visu*.

(Arg. iv. 493-6.)

This would appear to be for *adferens fastidia* 'inspiring disgust merely by the sight of them'; but it is a super-

ficial appearance. Valerius' idea is more subtle than that.

The Harpies starve themselves whilst they starve Phineus: '*parque mihi monstrosque fames*' (v. 456) he says; and '*saevit utrimque fames*' (ib. 499). *ipso visu* is for *visu tantum*: the filthy fowls will not eat what they have defiled, so they may be said to be 'at once batted on, and disgusted or mocked by, the mere sight of the food.' This, then, is no case of *fastidium ferre* = *fastidium adferre*, but only a slight extension from the idea of disgust towards the idea of delusion or mockery.

Had the meaning been 'inspiring disgust' he would naturally have written *movens fastidia*, as is usual in poetry, especially when *fastidia* means physical disgust: there are examples in Ovid, Martial and Juvenal, which it is unnecessary to quote. (See Mayor on Juvenal x. 202).

2. Now for the certain attestations of the phrase: but let it be premised that *fastidium*, *fastidia*, *fastus* are exchangeable, and *pati* may substitute *ferre*.

Ecl. ii. 14-15:

nonne fuit satius tristes Amaryllidis iras
atque superba *pati fastidia*?

Aen. iii. 326-7:

Stirpis Achillae *fastus* iuvenemque superbum
servitio enixae *tulimus*.

Hor. Epist. II. i. 215:

Spectatoris *fastidia ferre* superbi.

Prop. IV. v. 42:

nec te Medae delectent probra sequacis:
nempe *tulit fastus* ausa rogare prior.

Sil. Ital. vii. 464-6:

iussis Saturnia silvis
iudicium Phrygis et *fastus* pastoris et Iden
post fratris *latura* toros.

In the absence of any one certain or probable instance of *ferre* = *adferre fastidia*, I think these are enough to warrant us in overriding Servius' interpretation, on which all the modern ones (e.g. Conington) depend: '*matri enim decem menses attulerunt longa fastidia*,' especially in view of the remainder of his note, which offers two alternatives (firstly):

alii '*abstulerint*' legunt, ut sit: si riseris, abstulerint decem menses matri tuae longa fastidia, (and finally) *quia praegnantem solent fastidia pati*.

The third, expressed by the italicised words, is a Danieline adjunct. Before drawing any conclusion from them, let me call some further witnesses who have not yet been heard.

There are a group of Patristic testimonia quite as worthy of attention as the grammarians whom Ribbeck quotes:¹ S. Ambrose, *Expos. Psalmi cxviii.* 15-16:

non possum salvo pietatis iure odisse patrem cui debeo quod creatus sum, matrem *longo decem mensium fastidio* pii fetus onera portantem . . . *e. q. s.*

S. Jerome, *Epist.* xxi. 2. 5:

quae autem potest maior esse clementia quam ut filius Dei hominis filius nasceretur, *decem mensium fastidia sustineret*, partus expectaret adventum, involveretur pannis, subiceretur parentibus, per singulas adoleret aetates *e. q. s.*

Id. *Epist.* xxii. 39. 2:

Dei filius pro nostra salute hominis factus est filius, *decem mensibus* in utero ut nascatur expectat, *fastidia sustinet*, cruentus egeritur, involvitur pannis, blanditiis deridetur; et ille cuius pugillo mundus includitur praesepis continetur angustiis.

From these manifest recollections of Virgil one may infer that *sustinere fastidia* is yet another synonym, and that Ambrose took it to be the mother who is said to suffer a weary disgust; and Jerome, the child. Which is right?

I take sides with St. Ambrose, because both the general and the particular probabilities incline that way: it is more natural, and the Danieline adjunct is for it. What follows? *Matri* must become *mater* or *matres*, the subject of the sentence; and *longa fastidia* will be construed in apposition to *decem menses*. *Matres* is likelier since (1) the MSS. are divided between *matri* and *matris*, and (2) agree in presenting a plural verb. If *matres*, then we have a generic sentence to balance the generic *qui non risere parentes* of 62. But the verb still remains in doubt. Can *tulerunt* be retained as a gnomic tense? I would prefer to venture

MATRES longa decem TOLERANT fastidia menses.

Were TOLERANT once miswritten TOLE-

RVNT it would easily engender TVLE-RVNT.

I cannot produce an example of *tolerare fastidia*,² but if *ferre*, *pati*, and *sustinere* are interchangeable it is hardly conceivable that *tolerare* is not Latin in the same sense. *Tolerare militiam* and *tolerare vitam* are Virgilian.

In conclusion, let me set out the final quatrain to show its symmetry according to this conjecture:

incipi, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem:
matres longa decem tolerant fastidia menses.
incipi, parve puer; qui non risere parentes,
nec deus hunc mensa dea nec dignata cubili est.

a chiasmus of singulars and generic plurals.

Ecl. v. 43:

Daphnis' epitaph is given as

Daphnis ego in silvis, hinc usque ad sidera notus.

Conington finds *hinc usque ad sidera* 'rather a flat expression,' but he turns his blind eye to a much graver difficulty—namely, the absence of any word to indicate burial. In Theocritus (i. 118):

Δάφνις ἐγὼν Ὅδ' ἔτηνος ὁ τὰς βόας κ.τ.λ.

does it with a minimum, but the minimum is wanting in our Virgil text. If, then, *hinc* is offensive and *usque* is needless, the problem is simple. Read Daphnis ego IN SILVIS SITVS HIC, ad sidera notus.

SITVS disappeared by haplography; HIC ad sidera notus was expanded to HINC VSQVE ad sidera notus.

Cf. Buecheler-Riese A.L. *pars post.* No. 646.

hic situs in tumulo

if one need exemplify a formula of which the indices of the A. L. offer dozens of instances.

G. i. 360:

iam sibi tum curvis male temperat unda carinis
cum medio celeres revolant ex aequore mergi,
etc., etc.

(Curvis M. Gud. a curvis Rom. and Arusianus).

Editors sadly takes sides, some for a gratuitously clumsy accumulation of

¹ Aelius Donatus, Probus, and the Statian scholiast. All these are witnesses to the scansion *tulerunt*, which is, of course, a possible scansion, but unexampled elsewhere in the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*.

² At the risk of a charge of *incertum per incertius*, I will confess a suspicion that in Propertius III. xiii. 10 the true reading is: 'quis toleret fastus, Icarioni, tuos?'

datives, others for an elision which is not merely cacophonous but abolishes the distinctive sound of the most emphatic word in the sentence: 'iam tum . . . cum.'

No need for either course. Look at Servius:

'Scias, inquit, iam in pelago esse gravissimam tempestatem cum ad litora mergi confugunt, poetice autem ait "iam sibi tum unda male temperat curvis carinis," id est sibi non parcit, sed crescit in perniciem suam; nam in carinam scindendo¹ (?) consurgit.'

'Temperat' autem absolute posuit, aut certe subauditur male temperat se ipsam sibi.

All the truth of this note lies in the first word: *scias*. Virgil does not say *scias*; but he has at v. 365:

saepe etiam stellas . . . videbis.

Read

iam TIBI tum curvis male temperat unda caverris,

and the 'Ethic' dative explains Servius' *scias* and prepares for the verb in the next sentence being a second person singular.

G. iv. 484:

atque Ixionii vento rota constitit orbis

deest 'cum' et hoc dicit: cum vento suo rota constitit, id est cum causa volubilitatis quievit, et aliter: 'vento' pro adventu significat, ut sit septimus casus: aut 'ventu' verbum gerundi est (nam intelligi debet adventu): sit enim gerundi sic 'ventum ventu': ipse alibi 'et pacem Troiano ab rege petendum,' quidam sic: 'vento' audiendum consistente, ut est illud 'cum placidum ventis staret mare' (Ecl. ii. 26).

(Serv. ad loc.)

subaudi 'cum,' ut illo loco 'atque Ixionii,' etc. (Serv. ad Aen. i. 190.)

deest 'cum' . . . ut 'atque Ixionii,' etc. id est cum vento. (Serv. ad Aen. iii. 226.)

The same explanation repeated on Aen. viii. 216 and on G. i. 218:

Constitit orbis. Causa volubilitatis quievit. (Schol. Bern.)

The question of this crux has not advanced much since Heyne's note (Exc. in vol. i. p. 696). The ancient

explanations (set out above) rather indicate than solve the difficulty. *Vento* must have been felt to be very intolerable if *ventu* for *adventu*, without a genitive to define whose coming, was worth considering as a remedy.

1. The seat of disease is plain: as the words stand *rota* is meaningless.

Staminea rhombi ducitur ille rota
(Prop. III. vi. 26.)

does not help it: the *rota* is part of the *rhombus* and the expression therefore correct. Nor does

radiisque rotarum
districti pendent. (Aen. vi. 616.)

for *radii* are part of a wheel.

2. And, secondly, *vento* is meaningless. Heyne discusses gravely whether the wind blows in Hell, and decides yes. So far good: let us allow him this. But what has the wind to do with Ixion's wheel? I cannot find in Roscher any indication that it was ever represented in art or in word as spun by wind power; no writer connects any sails with it. Analogy rather suggests that this wheel was an automatic top. Ixion is, as it were, a gigantic *ivvξ*. But if it is not the wind which moves the wheel, the explanation *vento consistente constitit rota* fails.

Suppose Virgil wrote

atque IXIONI[VS MOM]ENTO constitit orbis,

and that a puncture or erasure obliterated the letters bracketed, or (more precisely) cleft the second M of *momento* and the V of *Ixionius*, what would a scribe naturally make of the remains? A nominative, *tant bien que mal*, must be found for *Ixionii orbis*, and it must have the length of two *morae*. Or, maybe, *rota* was already there as a gloss on *orbis*. 'Momento' = in a moment, for a moment' is Augustan (Horace, Livy, Ovid, etc.); usually with *horae* or *temporis*, but not always: e.g. Livy xxi. 14.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University,
Glasgow.

¹ Carina scindenda Thilo-Hagen.

JUPITER AND THE TRIUMPHATOR

It is a common belief that in the Roman triumph the victorious general personated Jupiter. This belief seems to have grown gradually stronger since the days of Preller and Marquardt, when (so far as I know) it was first promulgated, until it is no longer thought necessary to examine the evidence on which it rests. Lately Mrs. S. Arthur Strong has carried it a point further than any of her predecessors, insisting that the triumphator actually *was* Jupiter for the time being, *i.e.* (I suppose) was believed by the spectators to be the god; and no doubt this view finds some support in the excellent account of the triumph by Aust in Roscher's *Lexicon* (*s.v.* Iuppiter), and in the second edition of Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer*.¹ On the other hand, two very careful English scholars, Dr. Stuart Jones and the late Dr. Greenidge, avoid this conclusion entirely when writing of the triumph, and describe the dress and attributes of the triumphator as simply those of the ancient Italian (or Etruscan) king.²

Sir James Frazer, in the last edition of the *Golden Bough*, combines these two views ingeniously.³ His object is to show that 'the Roman kings' personated Jupiter, were representatives or embodiments of the god, after an oriental fashion now familiar to us all, largely as the result of his labours; and his argument seems to be the following. The triumphator was a personation of Jupiter; but he wore the attributes of the old kings: therefore the old kings personated Jupiter. Unluckily he does not distinguish between the earlier kings and the later Etruscan ones, forgetting that the Capitoline temple, with which the triumph is indissolubly connected,

was the work of Etruscan kings, that there was no image of Jupiter before that temple was built, and that without such an image it is hardly possible that there could have been an impersonation. A trace of the older form of triumph, or rather the native germ of the later practice, survives in the account given by Livy (i. 10) of the deposition of spoils by Romulus on the oak of Jupiter Feretrius, of whom there was certainly no image. This simple cult had all the life taken out of it by the gorgeous triumphal ritual of the Etruscan kings; and if Sir James had limited his argument to these, he might have made out a fairly good case. If there is anything certain in Roman antiquities, it is that the triumph and all belonging to it were of Etruscan origin;⁴ and it is not impossible that the oriental idea of the divine king and the embodiment of a god in him, may have trickled as a survival through an Etruscan channel into Roman times. But this involves us in the labyrinthine question of Etruscan ethnology, into which I am not competent to enter. I am concerned with the Romans and their beliefs and mental habits, which Etruscan ornament and ritual affected, in my conviction, only as a veneer, without penetrating into the living tissue.

I have myself always accepted the doctrine that the triumphator personated Jupiter, since Mr. Rushforth drew my attention to it when writing his excellent article *Triumphus* in the *Dict. of Antiquities* (ed. 2). But lately Mrs. Strong's language has stimulated me to re-examine the evidence carefully, in order to find out whether the Romans believed this doctrine themselves. The result is that, for the period of the Republic at least, I find my former belief very much shaken.

To begin with, let me note a point which has not, I think, been sufficiently considered; at any rate in this country. The ritual of the triumph is so closely connected with that of the 'pompa Circensis' of September 15, that it is impos-

¹ Ed. 2, p. 127. 'Der triumphirende Feldherr ist in allen Stücken ein menschliches Abbild des Juppiter O.M., unter dessen Schütze er den Sieg erfochten hat und dem die Ehre des letzteren gebührt.' This does not go so far as Mrs. Strong; a copy is not the real original. Mrs. Strong's view will be found in her *Apotheosis and After Life*, pp. 64 and 168.

² Stuart Jones, *Companion to Roman History*, pp. 195, 328. Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, p. 44, and also in article 'Rex' in *Dict. of Antiquities*, ed. 2.

³ *Golden Bough*, ed. 3, pt. I., vol. ii. 175 f.

⁴ See Müller-Deecke, *Etrusker*, vol. II., p. 199. Fowler, *Roman Religious Experience*, p. 239.

sible to separate them in a discussion of this kind. Both belong to the cult of the Capitoline Jupiter: both were undoubtedly rooted in the old Italian practice of the 'votum'.¹ The whole of the great September festival, the 'epulum Iovis,' the 'pompa,' and the 'ludi circenses,' constituted the fulfilment of vota made a year before by king or consul; the triumph was probably a special or occasional form of the same ritual, the magnificence of which, whatever may have been its ultimate origin, was due almost beyond doubt to the period of the Etruscan kings of Rome. Both in 'pompa' and triumph we see the *ornatus* which the Romans themselves ascribed to Etruria, and no doubt rightly. In both the 'quadriga' or four-horse chariot was used to convey the presiding magistrate or victorious general, and the dress of these two was the same, the 'toga picta' and 'tunica palmata,' 'quae augustissima vestis est tensas ducentibus triumphantibusve.' The details were in fact so much alike that the well-known passage in Juvenal about the 'pompa' has often been quoted as evidence for the triumph, and Aust, in his excellent account in Roscher's *Lexicon*, ventures to assert that in both the leading figure, triumphator or presiding magistrate, was a representative of Jupiter.² For me, however, there is a serious difficulty in this conclusion. In the 'pompa' Jupiter took part in person; his image was carried in its 'tensa' to the circus and back to its temple. It is therefore impossible to suppose that consul or praetor represented Jupiter, seeing that the god was there on his own account, and that no Roman author suggests such a representation. Why then, in the parallel ritual of the triumph, should the triumphator be supposed to be or to represent the god? I confess I do not understand how he could be conceived as fulfilling vows made to himself.

But it may be said that whatever difficulty I may find here, the Romans at any rate had none, for *they believed* that the triumphator, if not the consul in the

'pompa,' was actually Jupiter. This is what Mrs. Strong insists on. But did they so believe? I have sought in vain for any trace of such a belief in the whole literature of the republican period, *i.e.* the period when triumphs were most sought after and most frequent. Nor in the many accounts of triumphs which go back to that period, in Livy, Dionysius, Appian and Plutarch,³ is there any hint of such a belief, so far as I have been able to discover. A striking fact is the investment of Masinissa by Scipio with the 'ornamenta triumphalia,' as described by Livy;⁴ who could not possibly have written the following words if he had himself supposed, or knew of others supposing, that the *ornatus* here described was that of the great god of the Roman Capitol. His words show clearly enough what he himself thought about it; it was the *ornatus* of the Rex, to which that of the triumph was a reversion.

'Postero die, ut a praesenti motu averteret animum eius, in tribunal escendit et concionem advocari iussit. Ibi Masinissam, *primum regem appellatum*, eximiisque ornatum laudibus, aurea corona, aurea patera, sella curuli, et scipione eburneo, toga picta et palmata tunica donat. Addit verbis honorem; neque magnificentius quicquam triumpho apud Romanos neque triumphantibus amplioem eo ornatu esse; quo unum omnium externorum dignum Masinissam populus Romanus ducat.'

Yet this same Livy had already, not indeed in a description of a triumph, but in a rhetorical passage occurring in an imaginary speech, alluded to this *ornatus*, or part of it, as 'Iovis optimi maximi ornatus.'⁵ Decius is contrasting

¹ Most of these passages are cited by Aust in Roscher's *Lexicon*, s.v. Iuppiter, p. 726 at top.

² Liv. xxx. 15. Cf. xxvii. 4, where Syphax and other 'reges' are thus honoured.

³ Liv. x. 7: 'Quod cum ita se habeat, cui deorum hominumve indignum videri potest, inquit, eos viros quos vos sellis curulibus, toga praetexta, tunica palmata, et toga picta, et corona triumphali laureaue honoraritis, quorum domos spoliis hostium affixis insignes inter alias feceritis, pontificalia atque auguralia insignia adiicere? Qui, Iovis optimi maximi ornatu decoratus, curru aurato per urbem vectus in Capitolio ascenderit, si conspiciatur cum capite ac lituo, capite velato victimam caedat, auguriumve ex arce capiat?'

¹ See *Roman Festivals*, p. 216 and *reff.* Liv. 45-39.

² Liv. v. 41, where 'tensas ducentibus' indicates the ritual of the 'pompa.' Cf. Liv. x. 7.

³ Juv. x., 36 f., and Mayor's elaborate note: Aust, p. 736 b.

the insignia of the magistrate, whether ordinary or triumphal, with those of pontifices and augurs; if a plebeian can enjoy the use of the former, why not of the latter? There is a rhetorical point gained in calling the triumphal insignia the 'ornatus Iovis'; but the question for us is, what does Livy mean by this, which is positively the first hint we have of any such designation. Personally I am of opinion that he simply alludes to the fact that the ornatus was a part of the ritual of the great Jupiter, and was appropriately kept in his temple. So later on Juvenal can speak of the 'tunica Iovis' worn by the presiding magistrate in the 'pompa'; and Juvenal is quoted to the same effect by Servius, which does not add to the weight of evidence.¹ On the other hand Festus, in his gloss on 'picta toga' and 'tunica palmata,' though he mentions two temple pictures of triumphing consuls, has no word about 'ornatus Iovis'; whence we may infer that the learned Verrius Flaccus, whom he is following, either knew nothing or cared nothing about any attribution of the ornatus to Jupiter.²

There is some evidence that the 'toga picta' and 'tunica palmata,' as well as the sceptrum of ivory, were kept in the temple, and might therefore be very well called 'ornatus Iovis.' It could not have been easy to make these magnificent robes, and by wearing those deposited in the temple the triumphator would perhaps gain some additional sanctity, besides saving his pocket, which would be drawn upon pretty heavily on the occasion. It is said that Marius summoned the Senate to meet in the temple on the Capitol after his triumph over Jugurtha, and appeared himself in triumphal costume—whether intentionally or not is not stated. See—

¹ Juv. *l.c.* Serv. ad *Ecl.* x. 27. Servius writing in the fourth century A.D. under the influence of philosophy and imperial apotheosis, has travelled far beyond the old Roman ideas of the triumph: 'Aether autem est Iuppiter. Unde etiam triumphantes, qui habent omnia Iovis insignia, sceptrum, palmatam togam, qua utebantur illi qui palmam merebantur. Unde ait Iuvenalis,' etc. For three centuries before Servius wrote this, the triumph had been a monopoly of the emperor and his family. 'Exuviae' seems only to be used of the god's dress in the 'pompa': Festus 500, ed. Lindsay.

² Festus, p. 228, ed. Lindsay.

ing that the senators were annoyed, he went out and changed it for the usual praetexta—that is, no doubt, he replaced it in the temple repository whence he had taken it for the ceremony.³ There are one or two passages in the lives of the emperors which point in the same direction. In the life of Alexander Severus (ch. 40) we read that he only used the 'toga picta' as consul, and then only that one 'quam de Iovis templo sumptam alii quoque accipiebant aut praetores aut consules,' i.e., for the 'pompa circensis.' Gordian was the first to own a dress of this kind as private property: all previous Caesars had used one taken 'vel de Capitolio vel de Palatio.'⁴ By these last words I understand that a set of these robes was kept in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, perhaps for use at the 'ludi Apollinares'; which is a fair proof that they were not supposed to be the exclusive insignia of Jupiter. But it is argued that not only the robes, but the four-horse chariot, and the ivory sceptre surmounted with an eagle, were attributes of Jupiter, and that the triumphator had his face reddened with minium, like that of the image of the god. I will take this last point, which is an interesting one, to begin with.

As I have here stated them, the facts are undoubted; the face of the triumphator was reddened with minium, and so was the face of the image of Jupiter when he was carried in his 'tensa' to the Circus on September 15. But the question for us is whether there was a conscious imitation. The accurate Wis-sowa affirms this in his text, and in a footnote refers us to three passages, one of Pliny and two of Servius;⁵ but when we turn out these passages the proof is

³ Plutarch, *Marius*, 12 ad fin.

⁴ Vita Alex. Severi, 40; Julius Capitolinus, Gordiani tres 4. 4. These passages are usually referred to (not quoted) to prove that the triumphator figured as Jupiter; when examined they appear to be no proof at all.

⁵ Plin. *H. N.* 33. 111. Serv. *Ecl.* 6. 22; 10. 27. The learned Servius gets out of his depth under the impression that red was the 'color aetherius.' Pan had his face smeared red for this reason, 'propter aetheris similitudinem.' He evidently knew nothing of the practice except from books, and I suspect that in his time (fourth century) it had fallen out even in the case of emperors.

not to be found in them. Pliny, for instance, writes thus: 'Enumerat auctores Verrius quibus credere necesse sit Iovis ipsius simulacri faciem diebus festis minio inlini solitam, triumphantiumque corpora, sic Camillum triumphasse.'

If Pliny had meant us to understand that there was, or ever had been, an imitation, he would have told us that the face of the man was reddened to look like the face of the god; instead of which he speaks of the face of the god and the body of the man. (We may note by the way that neither Verrius nor Pliny seem to know anything of the practice except from books.) What was the meaning of the practice in the case of the god? From another passage of Pliny we learn that the first image of Jupiter in the Capitoline temple was of terra cotta ('fictilis'), and was reddened for that reason. It seems to have been the practice to redden old Italian images and portrait busts of terra cotta, in order to give them an expression of more intense life. Plutarch knew this, and refers to it in his 98th Roman Question. For this same reason the quadriga of Jupiter on the fastigium of his temple was 'miniated'.¹

The reddening of the triumphator had not quite the same object, so far as I can see. All the world over red colouring is used as a war-paint, or for religious purposes, e.g., at a war-dance; and the ancient Italian peasantry danced at their rustic festivals with their faces thus coloured, as Tibullus expressly tells us:²

Agricola et minio suffusus, Bacche, rubenti
primus in experta duxit ab arte choros.

There is thus no proof that the triumphator was reddened in imitation of Jupiter: the Romans do not tell us so, and anthropology suggests another explanation, to be sought far back in the history of mankind, long before the deities of Italy were introduced to their worshippers in iconic form.

But once more, it is said that the triumphator rode in the quadriga, 'which is no other than the chariot of the Sun-god, of Sol, who long before he

figured as Apollo in the Græco-Roman pantheon, was identified with the great Jupiter of the Capitol.' Again, 'recent scholarship goes so far as to identify the four-horse chariot of the Roman triumphator with the vehicle of the Sun-god's progress through the skies.'³ In a note Mrs. Strong explains that in these sentences she is relying on a paper by C. Fries, 'Studien zur Odyssee' in *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* for 1910. I do not know what weight Dr. Fries carries in the study of things Roman; the fact that he is not mentioned by the writer on Sol in Roscher's Lexicon, Fr. Richter (1913), would hardly seem to suggest his impersonation as 'recent scholarship' on a matter of Roman religion. The reader of this article will find no ground for supposing that Sol was anciently identified with Jupiter of the Capitol. Fr. Richter says rightly and emphatically that neither in the oldest religious calendar, nor in the priestly system of early Rome, is there the least trace of any worship of Sol and Luna; the later appearance of these on coin types is unquestionably due to Greek influence. For myself I believe that the quadriga (at all times a familiar feature in the Circus at Rome), which is claimed as the chariot of the sun, and therefore of Jupiter, was in reality nothing more wonderful than the special war vehicle of the old Italian king. There was nothing mystical or aetherial about it; it was a regal distinction, as Dionysius shows when he makes Romulus triumph in a quadriga, not that he might personate Jupiter (for of such personation he had obviously never heard), but that he might maintain the kingly dignity.⁴ Virgil evidently knew all about this, for he gives Latinus a quadriga because he was a 'rex,' and Turnus a biga because he was not one.⁵ And indeed common sense must reject the notion that a particular kind of chariot should be invented for a god in the first place, and then transferred to the use of man. The process, as we see in the sculptures of the Eastern nations, is exactly the opposite. When Jupiter at last became anthropomorphised at the

¹ Serv. *Ecl.* 6. 22. Plin. 35. 157.

² Tib. ii. 1. 55. On the general question of the use of red in ritual, see references in a note on p. 89 of my *Roman Religious Experience*.

³ *Apotheosis and After Life*, pp. 64 and 163.

⁴ Dionysius, ii. 34.

⁵ *Aen.* xii. 161 f.

end of the kingly period, they gave him the four horses with which they distinguished a great chieftain.¹

Lastly, the triumphator carried an ivory sceptre surmounted by an eagle, and it seems to be argued that though the sceptre may be of human origin, the eagle clearly points to Jupiter. Yes, but not in any more extended sense than the *aquila* of the legion, which was the symbol of Jupiter Opt. Max, the highest god of the Roman armies.² The 'rex' might carry it as the symbol of Jupiter without claiming to be the god himself, and so too the triumphator. Here I may point out that if the latter had really made this claim, he would surely have also carried the thunderbolt. Mrs. Strong does in fact assert that he did so, but without adducing any evidence for the statement. As a matter of fact, both his hands were engaged, the left with the ivory sceptre, the right with a branch of laurel.³ This seems sufficiently well proved, and neither in art nor literature, so far as I can discover, is the bolt to be found. Coins do not show it; and in the solitary passage (of Suetonius) which has been cited as proof, there is as usual no proof to be found. Among other absurd stories of omens at the birth of Augustus in 63 B.C., we are told that his father Octavius, marching 'per secreta Thraciae,' dreamt that he saw 'filium mortali specie ampliorem, cum fulmine et sceptro exuviisque Iovis Optimi Maximi ac radiata corona, super laureatum currum, bis senis equis candore eximio trahentibus.'⁴ If Suetonius had meant

this to be taken as a picture of a triumphator, he surely would not have given him *twelve* white horses. The number twelve was unprecedented and absurd, and no white horses had been used, so far as we know, since the legendary triumph of Camillus. But let us remember that this was a dream, and probably not only that but a pure invention; the exaggerated details were only suggested by an exuberant fancy, and have no bearing on the triumphator, whose two hands were engaged with more modest reminiscences of the ancient Roman, or perhaps more correctly Etruscan, kingship.

The triumphator, then, was not himself Jupiter, and it must remain very doubtful whether he even in any sense personated the god. It is quite plain that the Romans thought of him not as a god but as a man. The fact that he was supposed to be guarded from evil omens or influences by a 'fascinus,' and by the ribald jokes of his soldiers,⁵ only shows that he was a man elevated to such a pitch of greatness that unseen agencies might be working his downfall. Lastly, we are told that a slave stood behind him in the chariot, holding over his head a golden crown, and repeating the words 'Respite post te, hominem te esse' 'Respite post te, *hominem te esse memento*.' The fine chapter of Tertullian, in which this practice is mentioned, shows that it was used even in the triumphs of emperors, who alone in his time had the privilege of triumphing.⁶

On the evidence available I think it is clear that the triumphator was not believed by the Romans to be Jupiter. But if anyone can produce a coin or other work of art on which he is represented as holding the thunderbolt, I should at once reconsider the whole question.⁷ The bolt is to be found on the 'tensa' in which Jupiter himself was carried to the Circus on September 15; but that is quite a different matter.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

¹ The notion about Jupiter and Sol must have arisen from Livy v. 23, where Livy writes of Camillus that in his triumph he exceeded all previous magnificence, using even white horses;

² 'Iovis Solisque equis aequiperatum dictatorem in religionem etiam trahebant.' This is merely a rhetorical device to give point to the complaints; it was of course impossible that Livy should have had any information other than legend. Dio Cassius tells us that the Senate expressly voted white horses to Caesar for his triumph (43. 14), which makes it probable that they had not been used before. By that time no doubt they might be called, as Livy calls them, 'Iovis Solisque equos.'

³ See von Domaszewski, *Die Religion des Römischen Heer*, p. 12. Cf. Dionys. iii. 61; the eagle was given to the older Tarquin by Etruscan cities as a mark of his kingship.

⁴ Aust in Roscher's *Lexicon s.v.* Iuppiter, p. 726. I have examined the evidence there adduced, which seems sufficiently sound.

⁵ Suet. Aug. 94.

⁶ *Diet. of Antiquities*, vol. ii., 897 B.

⁷ Tertullian, *Apol.* 33; *Juv.* x. 41.

⁸ Prof. Gardner has kindly made search for me, but so far without result. Aust and the German writers on the subject, who use the evidence of coins freely, never allude to any work of art in which the triumphator wields the bolt.

NOTES

AESCH. P. V. 354.

Τυφῶνα θούρον πᾶσιν ὃς ἀντεστη
θεοῖς.

Read πᾶσιν ἐνστάτην θεοῖς 'adversary of all the gods.'

ὃς ἀντέστη gloss on rare word ἐνστάτην.

E. J. BROOKS.

tant word ὑπτια, as it obviously means this. The shields were not flat but more or less concave. The helmets would be put under the shadow of their rims.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos.

POLYBIUS III. 71. 4.

τὸ γὰρ τυχὸν ρείθρον μετὰ βραχείας ὄφρυνος, ποτὲ δὲ κάλαμοι καὶ πτέρεις καὶ τι γένος ἀκανθῶν οὐ μόνον πεζοῦς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἵππεῖς ἐνίοτε δύναται κρύπτειν, ἐὰν βραχέα τις προνοηθῇ τοῦ τὰ μὲν ἐπίσημα τῶν ὅπλων ὑπτια τιθέναι πρὸς τὴν γῆν τὰς δὲ περικεφαλαίας ὑποτιθέναι τοῖς ὅπλοις.

'Any water-course with a low bank and either reeds or bracken or some kind of prickly plants can often serve to conceal not only infantry but even the horsemen, if a little care is taken to put shields with conspicuous devices on the ground, their inner side uppermost, and to hide the helmets under the shields.'

This is interesting, especially at the present time, as it is evidently a 'tip' that Polybius had from some general. The τοὺς ἵππεῖς seemed to me at first peculiar, but now I see the force of the article. The horses of course could not be concealed by bracken and brambles, but would be concealed in the actual bed of the stream, and οἱ ἵππεῖς means their dismounted riders. Then it is interesting about the shields (for ὅπλα 'shields' not 'arms'). He says τὰ ἐπίσημα τῶν ὅπλων, so that all were not ἐπίσημα. The word as applied to a shield means 'with a device on it' (see the Thesaurus and many Inscriptions). It was not the surface of ordinary shields that it was dangerous to expose, but the surface of such as had devices. The surface of the ordinary shield was evidently dull and would not catch the rays of the sun, whereas the decorative devices on shields would do so. I need not defend my rendering of the impor-

TAM . . . QUAM.

A NOTE in Mr. Duff's scholarly edition of three dialogues of Seneca (Cambridge, 1915) raises the question What is the proper meaning of *tam . . . quam*? In the treatise *Ad Paulinum* 18. 3 occurs the following passage:

Tu quidem orbis terrarum rationes administras tam abstinenter quam alienas, tam diligenter quam tuas, tam religiose quam publicas.

Mr. Duff says: 'The meaning is, "You could not be more clean-handed, if the money belonged to a friend, or more careful, if it belonged to yourself, or more scrupulous, if it belonged to the nation." But it *did* belong to the nation; hence Bentley proposed *sacras* for *publicas*; but the change is violent.'

No change is necessary. The solution of the difficulty lies in seeing clearly that *tam . . . quam* (or *tamquam*) means properly not 'just as if,' but 'just as.' In certain connexions, no doubt, *tam . . . quam* (or *tamquam*) is equivalent to *tam . . . quam si*; but not always or necessarily. For example, 'He behaves towards me as a brother' (*tamquam frater*) might be said of one who actually is my brother; it would then mean 'as one brother behaves towards another.' Thus the above passage of Seneca might be paraphrased as follows: 'You (as *prae-fectus annonae*) administer the revenues of the entire world unselfishly, as if they belonged to a friend (= *tamquam si alienas administras*); with close attention, as if they were your own (= *tamquam si tuas administras*); conscientiously, as belonging to the state (= *tamquam publicas administras*). The distinction depends on whether an in-

dicative or a subjunctive is to be supplied in order to complete the sense. Contrast the two following passages of Plautus: (1) *Qua lubet perambula aedis oppido tamquam tuas* (*Most.* 809 'as if they were your own,' supply *perambules*); to which Theoprides replies with surprise '*Tamquam?*' because he is under the impression that the house really is his: (2) *SAG. Esne tu huic amicus?* *Tox. Tamquam di omnes qui caelum*

colunt (*Persa* 581, 'as much as all the gods,' supply *sunt amici*).

The use of the subjunctive after *tamquam* is treated above as postulative (i.e. as depending on *si* understood), and so it is generally treated by grammarians. But it might be equally well explained, I think, as denoting conditioned futurity: *tamquam administres*, 'as you would administer.'

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

REVIEWS

THE DRAMAS AND DRAMATIC DANCES OF NON-EUROPEAN RACES.

The Dramas and Dramatic Dances of Non-European Races. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY. Cambridge University Press, 1915.

PROFESSOR RIDGEWAY in the present work undertakes to criticise his critics. The theory set forth in his *Origin of Tragedy* that Greek Tragedy originated in the worship of the dead has been assailed by the upholders of rival explanations framed in terms of totemism, fertility-rites, initiation-rites, *mana*, and so forth. He retorts that these anthropological principles are not 'primary;' that such phenomena one and all themselves originated in the worship of the dead. Therefore Greek Tragedy did not come into existence by way of these secondary developments, but arose directly from the worship of the dead. The argument is unconvincing. Even if it can be shown that your far-off ancestor was an ape, it does not follow that your father was an ape.

Here my sole concern must be with the validity of the anthropological principles to which Professor Ridgeway assigns a secondary rank. The question of the origin of Greek Tragedy is hardly my affair, when so many are better qualified to discuss it. But I am personally subjected to a good deal of drastic, though perfectly good-natured, criticism for my advocacy of *mana* as a root-principle of explanation applying

to the origins of magical and religious rites. 'With the theories of Kuhn, Max Müller, Mannhardt, Frazer, and Marett must fall the doctrines of Greek Tragedy based upon them by Professor Dieterich, Dr. Farnell, Miss Harrison, Mr. Cornford, and Professor G. G. Murray, and that of Hindu Tragedy founded upon them by Professor A. B. Keith.' Fortunate are the classical scholars whose views are impugned. Though they occupy the forward trenches, Professor Ridgeway's heavy artillery directs its high-angle fire to their rear. We of the supports catch it.

In the interests of pure fighting, I could almost wish that I did not agree with Professor Ridgeway so fully as I do. As it is, I have always believed, and have said repeatedly in print, that animism may be as primitive as *mana*, or as Sir James Frazer's 'magic,' or as anything else belonging to the order of magical or religious facts. After all, we have good reason to hold that Mousterian man of the mid-pleistocene period buried his dead with an eye to their comfort in a future state. Even if we put down his date at a beggarly fifty thousand years ago, and do not postulate a round million with the more robust votaries of prehistorics, that would allow a very fair time in which secondary developments of animism might occur, ere ever Thespis took to his waggon. On the other hand, the French caves of

the Reindeer Age afford strong indications of the existence of hunting-rites of the kind that figures so prominently in *The Golden Bough*. Whether the animals represented at Niaux or Tuc d'Audoubert were in the first instance made the object of ceremonies, not on their own account, but because they were such as might have eaten the human dead, as according to Professor Ridgeway's theory of the origin of totemism, is not known. As a matter of fact, nearly all of them are herbivores. At any rate, however, it is pretty clear that, say, fifteen thousand years ago, ritual observances devoid of any anthropomorphic element, at all events so far as concerns the accompanying art-forms, were already in vogue. The alleged 'parasitic growth' had plenty of time in which to foster parasites of its own—on the principle that 'the little fleas have lesser fleas . . .'—before Thespis exploited ritual in the interests of art.

Now I have no call to defend the theories of Sir James Frazer, much less to support any of those explanations of Greek Tragedy that have been founded thereupon. All I would point out is that the fertility-rites to which these explanations refer us are in Sir James Frazer's sense of the term primarily 'magical.' But is 'magic' in this sense any less primary a source of ritual than the worship of the dead, on Professor Ridgeway's own showing? Having laid it down that the essence of religion consists in 'the belief of the existence of the soul after the death of the body and the worship of the dead,' he goes on to declare that 'Religion is at least as early a stage as Magic, and certainly is not later.' So it would seem that fertility-rites in so far as they embody 'magic' may be as primary as animism after all. By this all too generous concession Professor Ridgeway appears to me to give away his whole case. For the rest, his ingenious method of disposing of the priest of Nemi does not greatly affect the general question of the validity of 'fertility-magic' as a principle of explanation, either absolutely or even in an *ad hominem* way; since Sir James Frazer at the end of the third edition of *The Golden Bough* in-

forms the startled reader that the priest of Nemi, having served his turn as a peg on which to hang facts, may now himself go hang.

And now for *mana*. 'The term *mana* . . .,' writes Professor Ridgeway, 'has come into the nomenclature of Comparative Religion from Dr. R.R. Marett's essay on Pre-Animistic Religion. His statements have not unreasonably been taken to mean that there was a pre-animistic stage in the evolution of Religion, though he now disclaims this interpretation, yet hardly with success.' I am sorry that I have managed to convey a false impression to Professor Ridgeway, and still more sorry that he should find it inconvenient to give that false impression up. My view has always been that *mana*, or wonder-working power, may be attributed to a rite that in its inception has had nothing to do with animism, but is inspired by some other notion, as, for instance, by what Sir James Frazer would call 'magic,' namely, the sympathetic principle. Thus a Melanesian picks up a stone that is fearfully and wonderfully shaped in the likeness of a yam, and concludes that it has *mana* for making yams grow. I believe that the wonder-working power is suggested in the first instance simply by the fact that the stone is so wonderfully like a yam. If the Melanesian, as apparently happens, explains the efficacy of his charm, not on the ground that 'like produces like,' but on the ground that the stone has 'eaten ghost,' I assume this to be a secondary gloss due to what Professor Ridgeway would himself call 'a natural extension' of the ghost-theory. The sympathetic principle, on the other hand, which whether reflectively grasped or not, undoubtedly operates as a motive, I regard as the primary source of the attribution of *mana* to the stone and to the fertility-rite that makes use of the stone; and therefore in such a context would term the underlying notion 'pre-animistic.' Whether animism goes back in time as far as, or even further than, the sympathetic principle is a consideration quite irrelevant to the issue whether in a given case the sympathetic principle preceded animism as a formative in-

fluence. If the excavation of a Roman villa in Britain yielded a piece of pottery of purely British design dating from about the year 200 B.C., one would have no hesitation in describing it as 'pre-Roman'; and a critic who objected that Rome was founded in 753 B.C. would be wasting ink.

Again, Professor Ridgeway attacks me for saying that primitive thought in regard to religion is relatively 'undifferentiated.' He calls attention to the complex nature—complex for us who know so little about it—of the social organisation of the Australian aborigines. He adds that the lower animals 'have in their own limited spheres a power of differentiation by sight, sound, and smell in matters vital to them utterly unknown to civilised men, though found in some degree in such races as the Australians, whose powers in tracking men and animals is [*sic*] too well known to need elaboration.' He concludes: 'Dr. Marett's hypothesis is therefore refuted by well-established facts.' But these facts are beside the point. The question is whether the thought is differentiated, whether the principle or ground of differentiation is not merely felt but understood. Plato deems the dog a philosopher, but the most philosophic of dogs never tried to think out his world of smells. As for the Australian, I have taken a lesson from a native in the art of throwing the boomerang, and it was exactly the same experience as being coached in golf by a very illiterate Scotch caddie. The aboriginal expert obviously had the 'how' of the matter, but he was quite unable to impart it by means of a 'why.' But I fear that Professor Ridgeway will run riot among such psychological niceties like a bull in a china shop. I wonder, however, that, considering the nature of his own special topic, he is not more in sympathy with my general psychological position, which I have tried to put in a phrase by saying that the typical savage dances out his religion rather than thinks it out. Moreover, I am ready to make an admission, if it be of any use to him. I certainly regard *mana* as a vague notion, since it stands for wonder-working power as displayed indiscriminately by men,

things, actions, and conditions, without making it clear whether the power is good or bad, personal or impersonal, mediated or automatic. On the other hand, I hold that there are primitive ways of conceiving 'soul'—Wundt has dealt at length with some of them—that are just as vague, and therefore, as far as the argument from vagueness goes, may be just as primitive.

So much for Professor Ridgeway's attack on *mana*, unless it be that it likewise comes within the sweep of the comprehensive judgment that forms his peroration. Having exploded the first principles of the anthropologists, including mine, and denounced the doctrines of the origin of Greek and Hindu Tragedy founded upon them, he prophecies as follows: 'And no less futile will be any other theories of their origin which hereafter may be built upon the principle that Man starts from the Abstract and only later proceeds to the Concrete.' 'Concrete,' by the way, is about the last epithet one would have thought of applying to a ghost. Professor Ridgeway appears to mean, however, that a living man who by his concrete behaviour acquires a reputation for *mana* will tend to be worshipped not only in life but also after death. Quite so. But things may similarly by their concrete behaviour acquire a reputation for *mana*. The Masai, for instance, prays to his medicine-man and to 'the Rain' (Engai) together, the balance of respect, if any, going to the Rain. Is 'the Rain' an abstraction? If so, it is one that is hypostatized in the next shower that falls after the prayer for rain. So Calverley wrote an ode to the abstraction 'Tobacco,' yet was careful to indicate the way of hypostatisation:

Smith, take a fresh cigar!
Jones, the tobacco-jar!
Here's to thee, Bacon!

I cannot agree, therefore, that Professor Ridgeway has disposed once for all of John Barleycorn by pronouncing him abstract. The 'Eniautos Daimon' is in another class—a class by himself. I grant that he is something of a philosopheme, and smacks more of Cambridge than of Athens.

I have come to the end of my space,

L

if not to the end of possible *adversaria*. One has naturally answered criticism with criticism. Professor Ridgeway is a 'bonny fighter,' and it is a pleasure to exchange blows with him. But I should like, by way of conclusion, to say how much anthropologists are likely to benefit from a book of this sort. The cult of the dead is a subject that hitherto has been sadly neglected. If, as it would seem, Sir James Frazer is about to compose another *magnum opus* on this very topic, so much the better. In the meantime, since there exists this aching void in our anthropological literature, classical scholars, who naturally look to the anthropologists to provide a conspectus of the facts, are almost bound to get the values wrong. Professor Ridgeway's 'euhemerism' will help to make

us realise that Man is worshipful at least as much as Nature. But, like the rest of us, he simplifies too much, and consequently exaggerates. He offers us a 'key to all mythologies,' and we need a whole bunch of such keys. Besides, he boasts to have 'proved to the full for the whole world' a theory resting on an induction that, if fairly searching as regards Asia, is miserably inadequate in regard to the rest of the primitive world. Four pages for Australia will hardly satisfy the anthropologists, nor would forty pages. So his book, like any other scientific book, marks a fresh beginning rather than an end; but at least we may say of it, 'Many will pass through, and science will be increased.'

R. R. MARETT.

Exeter College, Oxford.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION.

Archaeological Excavation. By J. P. DROOP, M.A., late Student of the British School at Athens. Pp. xi + 80, with eight diagrammatic figures in text. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1915. 4s net.

MR. DROOP'S archaeological reputation stands so high that this little book should, even at the present time, be widely read. It has been written 'chiefly with the idea of entertaining the many who by their interest and subscriptions have helped in the work of recovering the past.' At first sight such a statement might seem adequately to describe the scope of this essay. But reperusal will, I think, convince most readers that its value is far wider. It is, indeed, surprising that in so small a space the author should have been able to include so much really valuable information. Mr. Droop acknowledges that his experience of excavation is mainly confined to classical sites: it is to this limitation of scope that the only considerable defect of this book is due. After excavation in classical lands and, perhaps, in Egypt, most attention in this country is paid to the discovery of Roman remains, and one is tempted to wish that Mr. Droop had invited one of the staff who have worked at Corbridge

or Wroxeter to contribute some pages on the method of working a Roman site. This is not to challenge the author's claim that the general principles of archaeological work do not vary with locality; but local conditions must and do alter considerably the application of these principles. For example, Mr. Droop (p. 22) utterly condemns the method of trenching as a method of discovery. Yet on Romano-British sites this is the only safe means of ascertaining whether a given space is 'dead-ground' or contains buildings, wells and rubbish pits. At Caerwent it was the practice to cut such exploration trenches parallel to one another, and at intervals of 9 feet, running diagonally to the known alignment of the houses of the city. No buildings and very few pits or wells can have escaped such search.

Nevertheless, this book is one which the untrained or half-trained amateur will do well to study carefully and which the professed digger will read with interest. The most valuable section in the book is without doubt that devoted to the subject of stratification. It is, indeed, in his method of dealing with a stratified site that the archaeologist is differentiated from the dilettante hunter for antiques. The archaeologist's busi-

ness is primarily to build up the history of his site and so, indirectly, the history of the country in which that site lies: if he turns up good 'loot' in the process, so much the better; but the intrinsic importance of objects must never make him overlook the contribution such things may make towards material history. Equally true is it (as Mr. Droop points out) that objects of slight value must not be overlooked: here in England, thanks to Mr. Bushe-Fox, we are learning that even the commonest Roman pottery is often valuable dating material.

Another point on which Mr. Droop very rightly insists is the obligation to go down to virgin-soil. This duty was overlooked by nearly all early excavators, and even (I am informed) in one important 'dig' of recent times in England. To neglect to do this may mean that the whole early history of a site is left unread. As an example I would cite the Roman Villa at Northleigh. The excavators of the early nineteenth century cleared down to the floor levels of the 'villa' and there stopped: in the recent excavations carried out by Professor Haverfield it was ascertained that the foundations of an earlier building underlay the floors of the later 'villa,' and so the history of the site can now be carried back, from the era of the Constantine dynasty to, perhaps, the second century A.D.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Droop's plea against deception in restoration (pp. 54-55) will carry weight. With the fanatic who dislikes any sort of

restoration of buildings or objects no one of account any longer sympathises, but the 'faker' should be anathema in as much as he is falsifying historical or artistic material. It is useless to urge that in some cases the restoration is certain: Thorwaldsen did irreparable mischief to the Aeginetan marbles, yet probably he regarded his restorations as, at least, highly probable. The best plan in restoring an object or a statue is to make the restored portion easily distinguishable but not offensively so. Thus a piece of pottery may be restored in plaster coloured to resemble the original, but without reproduction of the ornamentation; or the gaps in a fresco may be filled in either in some neutral tint or by sketching on in *outline* the missing parts of the design. Such methods deceive no one, but—as Mr. Droop says—they help the imagination.

In conclusion, while heartily welcoming this book, I would venture to assure Mr. Droop that the account of the photographic activities of the expedition referred to on p. 50 is somewhat exaggerated. To photograph aimlessly and mechanically would indeed be absurd, but the practice of the expedition in question is to photograph adequately and without stint in cases where the photograph will be a valuable record—as for example to show the relation between (let us say) three layers of occupation.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

No. 13 Camp, Godford.

EARLY ZOROASTRIANISM.

Early Zoroastrianism. By JAMES HOPE MOULTON. Hibbert Lectures for 1912. Williams and Norgate. 10s. 6d. net.

Early Religious Poetry of Persia. By J. H. MOULTON. Cambridge: University Press.

EHEU, FUGACES! This book is full of ghosts. Like Odysseus standing by the trench, I think I see once again

that homely room where our master, E. B. Cowell, greater in spirit even than he was in learning, gave of his abundant stores to a small group of young disciples, of whom Dr. Moulton was one. If he can look down upon us from his serene abode, he will know that the seed he planted has once more borne fruit.

This particular fruit was much needed. Few are the workers in this

field, and it so happens that not all of them have been conspicuous for judgment. One could never be sure that the author of a theory would hold it until the next issue of the Oriental journals, and the Avesta offered good opportunities for the favourite Teutonic feat of building a pyramid upon its apex. Darmsteter's paradox is perhaps an extreme example, dealing as it did with principles while most scholars were debating details. But the labours of thirty years have done much to clear the rubbish away; England and America have co-operated in the work, and Dr. Moulton's sober judgment has set before us a good summary of results. One thing we might have wished to be otherwise; there is too much allusion in some parts of this book, for those who do not carry in mind all points of doubt and controversy. But the subject is complex, points of doubt are many, and the patient student can always find what he wants in the end.

Dr. Moulton's task has been to disentangle the real Zoroaster and his doctrines from later accretions. He does succeed in presenting a human figure, a reformer and preacher, no mystic, no magician, nor a materialist such as the superficial reader sometimes thinks he sees. Zarathrustra was a real person, 'already ancient when the Greeks first heard his name,' who preached a reformed religion in Bactria. The Gathas, which embody his doctrine, are written in a language which was once spoken, according to the author in Saïstan. The notion that the language was invented by late archaists is easily disproved, and Prof. Moulton does it. The Reformer found a tribal god, Ahura Mazda, worshipped; and of him he made an only god, having conceived the idea of monotheism. His conception was spiritual in essence, and any physical traits that may be alluded to here and there are survivals of the popular conception. God created all things, he knows all things, even the future; his sovereignty is supreme, but limited by the activities of the Evil Spirit. Later doctrine regarded these Good and Evil Spirits as twins, and one Gatha (quoted on p. 132) uses language which suggests the same idea; but it

maybe metaphorical language, implying that good and evil were co-eternal in the past, although the good is to destroy the evil in the end. A chance epithet, once applied to the Evil Spirit in the Gathas, later came to be his name, but Zarathrustra gave him no name. He identifies Evil with the Lie, not the only remarkable parallel to Christian doctrine. The Good Spirit whom he preached was not delighted with incense or sacrifice, but with a good life in his worshippers: truth, 'right belief, right speech, and right action,' these were his delight. In the doctrine there is neither mysticism nor asceticism.

In the later documents a great change is seen. Not only is there a return to Iranian polytheism, but there is something new. The Magi, which Prof. Moulton takes to be a contemptuous epithet for a formidable tribe, when conquered, captured the Zoroastrian religion, and grafted upon it their own ritual and doctrine. The chapter in which the history of the Magi is discussed is one of the best in the book; it contains an original investigation of a very difficult subject. They made Zoroastrianism into a mechanical system.

It is impossible to discuss all the questions which come under consideration: not only are they many and complex, but most of them are outside the scope of this *Review*. The book is of the greatest interest for the Christian theologian, whether for comparison, or the problem of origins, or for direct illustration of the Old Testament; in particular, the book of Tobit is Median in its atmosphere, while passages in Ezekiel and Micah, even in the New Testament, are illustrated. But it touches classical study in several points. Herodotus is one, and Prof. Moulton is warm in his praise of the value of Herodotus's evidence. The book may be called in many parts a commentary on Herodotus. Another is Strabo; and there is the ingenious theory that Virgil in his fourth *Eclogue* alludes to the story that Zarathrustra laughed when he was born:

incipè, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem.

An Appendix contains the documents on which the study of early Zoroastri-

anism is based: a new translation of the Gathas; Greek texts (translated) from Herodotus, Plutarch, Strabo, and Diogenes; and excursus on foreign forms of Zoroastrian names, with the Cappadocian Calendar. There are full indices.

The *Early Religious Poetry of Persia* is a little book of 170 pages, in which Prof. Moulton sets forth the story of the Avesta in a popular form. In some parts it covers the same ground as the larger work, but the subject is of course

treated in a different manner, in wide outline; and it contains much which in the larger work is assumed as known. Thus there is a general description of the Avesta, and an analysis of the Gathas, with specimens. The language is also treated, and its relation to Vedic Sanskrit, so as to make the matter clear to the reader who knows neither. It is an admirable book, clearly written and attractive, and it fills a place which has hitherto been empty in English.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

XENOPHON.

Xenophon: Cyropaedia, with an English translation by WALTER MILLER. Loeb Classical Library. Heinemann. 2 vols. 5s. each.

A COPY of the *Cyropaedia*, merely the text, must have been a considerable addition to the *impedimenta* of Africanus or Quintus Cicero. We now are in far happier case, and can carry in our pockets one, or even both, of Mr. Miller's pleasant little volumes, enriched, but not encumbered, with *variorum* text and a readable translation. Mr. Miller sticks close to the original. He is never, as Mr. Dakyns was apt to be, so carried away by enthusiasm as to indulge in little flourishes of his own. But he is master of a style that neither soars above nor sinks below the plain eloquence of the original.

There is indeed no fault to be found with the version, which is just a fair presentment of Xenophon. Many will wish that Philemon Holland's translation had been used for the Loeb Series. Where it does not correspond with a modern text, it would have been easy to add a footnote; and I had thought that "the translator general" had settled once for all with the *Cyropaedia*, nor ever regretted that Mr. Dakyns was unable to complete his task. I will place in contrast the new and the old translation of a few lines from the Story of Panthea, with no wish to disparage the new, which, judged by itself, is as good as can be wanted.

Holland: 'Now when Cyrus was come, and saw the woman sitting on the ground, and the dead corps there lying, he wept for very ruth of this hard fortune, and said withall, O valiant and faithful heart: alas the while: and hast thou left us and gone thy waies? With that he took him by the right hand: and loe, the dead man's hand followed him: for cut off it had beene by Aegyptians and dissevered from the body with an arming sword: which when he saw he grieved so much the more. The Lady also, setting up a piteous cry, and taking the hand from Cyrus kissed it, and fitted it againe as well as she could in the right place; saying also, The rest of his body, O Cyrus, is in the like case. But, what should you see and view the same? . . . For I, foolish and silly woman that I was, used many words to encourage him so to carry himself as might besee me your friend and one worthy of men's commendation: . . . Therefore he verily for his part hath had a noble and renowned death, whereas I who exhorted him thereto sit here alive. When Cyrus had continued a good while silent and weeping still, at length he spake and said, This Knight, Madame, hath made an excellent end. For he died with victory.'

Miller: 'And when he saw the lady sitting up on the ground and the corpse lying there, he wept over his loss and said: "Alas, O brave and faithful soul, hast thou then gone and left us?" And with the words he clasped his hand,

and the dead man's hand came away in his grasp; for the wrist had been severed by a sabre in the hands of the Egyptian. And Cyrus was still more deeply moved at seeing this; and the wife wept aloud; but taking the hand from Cyrus, she kissed it and fitted it on again as best she could and said: "The rest of his limbs also you will find in the same condition, Cyrus; but why should you see it? . . . For it was I that, in my folly, urged him to do his best to show himself a worthy friend to you. . . . And so," she said, "he has indeed died a blameless death, while I who urged him to it sit here alive." For some time Cyrus wept in silence and then he said aloud: "Well, lady, he indeed has met the fairest of ends, for he has died in the very hour of victory."

Well is it that Mr. Miller comes out no worse from the ordeal of such a comparison. Of course we sadly miss the flavour of the old, and hardly feel compensated by the accuracy of the modern. I judge from an accumulation of small indications that Mr. Miller has diligently studied the commentators. I should like to break a lance with him over the rendering of some of those moral terms that Xenophon delights in. But I must be content to take one example—a group of words that belong specially to Xenophon, and which, with help of Sturz, I have lately gone through—*ῥαδιουργία* and its relatives.

The renderings given by Mr. Miller in different passages are 'idleness' (VII. 5. 74 and 75), 'self-indulgence' (I. 6. 8), 'to be indifferent' (II. 1. 25),

'to conduct himself ill' (VIII. 4. 5). At I. 6. 34 it is not clear exactly what he assigns to the substantive. The words are *ἵνα μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἰσχυρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτοῖς ῥαδιουργίας προσγενομένης ἀμέτρως αὐτῇ χρῶντο οἱ νέοι*; and Mr. Miller renders 'lest in case lax discipline should give a free rein to their passions the young might indulge them to excess.' Dindorf renders here 'facilitas faciendi orta ex disciplina,' Hutchinson 'audacia,' Lenklau 'levitas.' This is the passage to which the statement found in Suidas and others that Xenophon used *ῥαδιουργία* as equivalent to *εὐκολία* is rightly held to apply. The statement is true enough. But Hesychius, etc.—or rather him from whom they derived—did not mean 'ease' in the sense of 'ready opportunity,' *facilitas*. They—or he—meant 'a readiness to do what is wrong.' Hence Hesychius' *ῥαδίως*¹ *εὐκόλως*—i.e. as in Sophocles' *ῥαδίως καθύβρισαν*, the only use of the word that could prompt a gloss. If, then, Mr. Miller means by 'lax discipline' laxity on the part of the boys, he is right. If he attributes the *εὐκολία* to the elders, as the rendering suggests, he is certainly wrong. There is no reason for separating this passage from the others. The only meanings of *ῥαδιουργία* in Xenophon are 'idleness,' the 'self-indulgence' that comes of idleness, and 'misconduct' or 'a propensity to misconduct.' Lenklau's *levitas* therefore was nearest the mark.

E. C. MARCHANT.

¹ So in *ῥαδίως ποιεῖ*, the first gloss on *ῥαδιουργεῖ* in Hesychius, we must see a reference to *immoral* conduct in *ῥαδίως*.

SUETONIUS.

Suetonius. With an English Translation by J. C. ROLFE, Ph.D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. 2 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. xxxii + 1-500; vol. II. pp. 1-556. Frontispiece. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London: W. Heinemann; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914. 5s. each.

IN these two volumes Professor Rolfe has edited and translated *The Twelve*

Caesars, and from *The Lives of Illustrious Men* the extant portions *On Grammarians*, *On Rhetoricians*, with the *Lives* of six poets accepted by the editor (Terence, Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Persius, and Lucan), one historian (the elder Pliny), and one orator (Passienus Crispus). Suitable introductions deal with the life and works of Suetonius and the MSS.; there is a useful bibliography; and the brief notes subjoined to the text sensibly elucidate the right sort of

points for readers of the Loeb Classical Library. The frontispiece represents a cameo of Tiberius with oak-wreath; the first volume ends with a 'stemma' of the Julio-Claudian family; while the second volume contains an index mainly of proper names. It is commendable that the remnants of *The Lives of Illustrious Men* should have been added and to some extent discussed; although it seems strange that, in the general sketch of the author's works, when recording the use made of Suetonius by later writers (p. xiii), the editor does not mention that he was a source for Jerome's amplification of the chronicle of Eusebius. With some disadvantage, at least to the ordinary reader, this is reserved for mention in the special prefatory note to the *Lives of Illustrious Men* in the second volume.

Of the MSS. a straightforward account is given, and broadly Ihm's text of 1907 is accepted for *The Lives of the Caesars*. The editor's position in this relation can be summed up in his remark: 'the text may be regarded as practically settled, at least until the independent value of the fifteenth-century codices has been demonstrated.' A reference is judiciously made to the views put forward in *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.* by Messrs. C. L. Smith and A. A. Howard regarding the later MSS.; and there is ground for the expectation that Ihm's estimate of the MSS. of *The Caesars* may have to be modified in the light of investigations made by Professor Howard of Harvard, as I gathered when I had the privilege of rendering him some little assistance in his examination of the *Codex Dunelmensis*. Professor Rolfe inserts brief, but for his purpose adequate, textual notes to record certain conjectures and variant readings.

It is mainly as a translation that Professor Rolfe's work is to be estimated. Rivalry with Philemon Holland is disclaimed; and nothing like his distinction of style is achieved, or perhaps should be aimed at; for there is point in the old epigram:

Philemon with 's Translations doeth so fille
us;

He will not let Suetonius be Tranquillus!

It was wiser, therefore, to produce a new translation, and 'let Suetonius be Tran-

quillus'; because not only is Holland at times inaccurate, but his Elizabethan pomp and quaintness are almost too distracting to convey the plain matter-of-fact tone of most that is in Suetonius, and his very English at times stands in need of interpretation for the twentieth-century reader. Professor Rolfe calls Suetonius' Latin style 'business-like,' and this fairly characterises his English rendering, which in the mass is a successful one—notably so in some of those few greater passages where Suetonius has allowed himself space. For example, the whole incident of Caesar at the Rubicon is tastefully and naturally translated. Usually the hexameters and elegiacs quoted are turned into corresponding English hexameters and elegiacs—some with quite good effect, while others to my mind would have been better converted into different metres. The translation does not lack the qualities of vigour and lightness: on the contrary, it is decidedly readable; but it is disappointing that the editor of a classic should suffer from defective proof-reading, inaccuracies in translation, and neglect of sound English.

That these blemishes may be eliminated in a new edition, it may be well to append a selection. Some are obvious misprints: e.g. in vol. I. p. 5, 'Nicomedes' for 'Nicomedes'; p. 28, 'opportunity'; p. 33, 'Cervennes'; p. 205, 'sphynx'; p. 302, 'Roman' for 'Romam'; p. 337, 'unassumming'; p. 419, 'Julia' for 'Junia'; in vol. II. p. 65, 'in particularly'; p. 391, 'poety'; p. 392, 'manuscripts'; p. 417, 'Epicadius' for 'Epicadus' of the Latin text, though Epicadius is retained in the index, p. 451, 'Tibulus.' In II. p. 470, *in honore* should be *in honorem*; and on p. 474 '*efflagitaret*' is an inexplicable subjunctive: is it meant for *efflagitarat*, or *efflagitabat*, which is the reading in Nettleship's *Ancient Lives of Vergil*? Sometimes there is inconsistency in spelling: e.g. I. p. 64, *incohata*, but II. p. 470, *inchoasset* and *inchoavit*; II. p. 266, *iantacula* in text, but *ientaculum* in note; II. p. 466 *egloga*, p. 480 *eglogas*, but p. 488 *eclogam*; II. p. 462 *sylvae*, but on pp. 412-413 *silva*; pp. 496-7, *Agathurni* in Latin, *Agathernus* in English. Sometimes the inconsistency is in the matter, which is more serious:

e.g. II. p. 495, the marginal notes give 34 A.D. and 62 A.D. as the dates of Persius' birth and death respectively; yet, three pages later, in the Latin text the editor leaves unchallenged *decessit . . . anno aetatis xxx*.

On questions of the right translation for certain words or phrases there is room for difference of opinion; and a few cases may be cited where I should differ from Professor Rolfe. The rendering of *cuius gentis familia est nostra* (I. p. 9) as 'the family of which ours is a branch' constitutes perhaps an inadvisable identification of *gens* and *familia*. *Filiorum . . . naturalem* (I. p. 364) would be more appropriately 'his own son' than 'his natural son,' which usually bears a different sense. 'The good people of Greece' is possibly too kindly a phrase for *Graeculis* (I. p. 308), although one need not import the mordant tone of Juvenal's *Graeculus esuriens*. 'General kissing' does not properly express *cotidiana oscula* (I. p. 342); nor is the rendering 'he made a display of simplicity' for *iactator civilitatis* (II. p. 66) free from ambiguity. At II. p. 471 it is difficult to see the propriety of 'though' in 'He also wrote the *Aetna*, though its authorship is disputed' as English for *scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur 'Aetnam'*; and at II. p. 485 it would be safer to say 'procured' or 'obtained,' instead of 'purchased' (*comparavit*), in reference to the securing of a clerkship by the impecunious Horace. *In aedilitate* (II. p. 70) is left untranslated. Of the bird-victims for Caligula-worship (I. p. 437) six are specified in the Latin, but only five in the English: if this arises from the grouping of *numidicae* and *meleagrides* together as 'guinea-hens,' a note to that effect would have been informative.

At I. p. 18 *biduo post* is translated 'on the following day'; and at I. p. 58 *post biduum* 'the very day after.' It is difficult, in spite of Roman habits of inclusive reckoning, to believe that *biduo post* is the same as *postridie*. Caesar has *biduo post* and *postridie* in adjoining chapters of the *De Bello Gallico*, I. 47 and 48, and they are not likely there to mean the same thing; and it is manifest that Cicero signifies by *biduum* the full space of two days in *uno die longiorem mensem faciunt aut biduo*.

There are other cases which clearly are mistakes. *Teutonis* in the ablative (I. p. 14) should not be taken from 'Teutones.' *Singula milia denariorum* (I. p. 358) is misrepresented as 'a hundred denarii to each.' *Necem matris et fratrum* (I. p. 420) is rendered 'death of his mother and brother' (singular); and the point is of significance, as only three chapters on Suetonius has *matris fratrisque* and then again *matris fratrumque*. 'The Green Faction' is given correctly for *prasinae factioni* (*Calig.* 55, I. p. 488); but unhappily the rival *factio Veneta* is also identified with 'the Greens,' II. p. 257; and then on p. 269 the latter is called 'the Blue faction.' This is sufficiently disconcerting nowadays; but to have confused 'the Blues' with 'the Greens' at certain periods of imperial Rome might have cost a man his life (see *Vitell.* ch. 14). *Dextro brachio*, II. p. 97, is rendered 'on his left arm'; nor is this the only time that *dexter* is mistranslated; for at II. p. 225 *in dexteriore latere* is said to be 'on the left side.' *Supplevit* in II. p. 417 means not 'supplied' but 'completed'; and *illud mirum admodum fuerit*, II. p. 222, does not mean 'it was very surprising.'

If these are slips in Latin, there are even more in English. Without being, if one may adapt Suetonius' phrase, *sermonis Anglici exactor molestissimus*, one ought to demand from a translator fair respect for English idiom and syntax, as well as a keen sense in words. To write, as in II. p. 410 of a word being 'stricken out' is to use archaic English; to say that Suetonius' writings 'may be listed' (I. p. xi) is, despite Raleigh and Dryden, to use what is now commercial English; to tell us in the preface, I. p. v, that 'a different meaning than his has been adopted,' or to say 'he aims to be strictly impartial,' I. p. xviii, or to translate *seductum* 'took him one side,' II. p. 225, is to use unidiomatic English; while to call offerings 'propitiary,' II. p. 297, is to use what is not English at all.

Several sentences lack clearness, e.g. I. p. 14, footnote, 'Of these one was selected by lot to conduct the trial, if one were necessary, and pass sentence,' where some will ask whether the second 'one' means 'trial' or whether it bears the same meaning as the first 'one.'

From the wording 'he allowed the envoys of the Germans to sit in the orchestra, led by their naïve self-confidence,' II. p. 53, who could be certain that 'led' means 'as he was influenced' (*commotus*)? Again, we read 'when one of these had been handed over for execution, just as he was paying his morning call, and at once recalled, as all were praising the Emperor's mercy, Vitellius gave orders to have him killed,' II. p. 269: fortunately the Latin is on the opposite page. Is it too much to call slipshod the syntax of the note in II. p. 238, 'According to Suetonius the arms were sent from the praetorian camp to Ostia to fit out the cohort, and that the riot started in the praetorian camp'? I trust it is not hypercritical to object to the extension of the meaning of 'regalia' to include ornaments connected with triumphs or consuls; e.g. I. p. 407; II. p. 49, p. 203, p. 287. It is, of course, notorious that the decorations or insignia of various orders and corporations have been styled by this resounding term, but if its employment

was pronounced improper as long ago as in Edmondson's *Complete Body of Heraldry* in 1780, then in a work of Roman associations the word might reasonably be restricted to emblems of royalty.

At II. p. 239 'a great storm arose and he had a bad fall' is irresistibly suggestive of Humpty-Dumpty, and at II. p. 103 it is comically alarming to take literally the sentence 'all kinds of presents were thrown to the people; these included a thousand birds . . . finally ships, blocks of houses and farms.' Lastly, we owe it entirely to the translator and not to Suetonius, if we find humour in 'Now in Nero's last year the whole grove died from the root up, as well as the hens.' This odd zeugma implying that the hens also 'died from the root up' is not suggested by the Latin, which has two quite solemn verbs, *silva omnis exaruit radicitus et quidquid ibi gallinarum erat interiiit*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

ROMAN CURSIVE WRITING.

Roman Cursive Writing, a Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Princeton University in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESSEN. Med. 8vo. Pp. 268 (with numerous facsimiles of cursive alphabets). University Press, Princeton (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press), 1915. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS dissertation supplies a consecutive history of Roman cursive writing from its earliest extant examples down to the time of its development into the 'national hands' and the Italian notarial scripts. The work was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. E. C. Richardson of Princeton; it has been continued under the influence of professorial teaching in Munich; and it has been completed with the aid of photographs and other facsimiles of the numerous documents which form a necessary part of the evidence here submitted to a most minute and elaborate examination.

After a brief survey of the passages in early Latin literature which refer to 'the use of wax tablets, and, probably, of cursive writing,' the author passes in review the successive specimens of that kind of script. The first century of our era is represented by the *graffiti* on the walls of Pompeii, and by the wax tablets of the Pompeian banker, Jucundus, while the second includes the Dacian tablets, and a few similar documents discovered in Egypt. Some eighty *papyri* of comparatively recent discovery, dating from the first five centuries, serve to fill the gap between the early *graffiti* and tablets above mentioned, and the late Ravenna *papyri* of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries.

A brief history of the early study of Roman cursive writing by Mabillon and Maffei, by Toustain and Tassin, and by C. T. G. Schönemann, is here followed by special mention of the publication of the Ravenna documents by Gaetano Marini in 1805; of the Dacian tablets

by Massmann in 1840 and by Mommsen in 1873; of the Pompeian *graffiti* by Chr. Wordsworth in 1837, by Garrucci in 1854, and Zangemeister in 1871; and, lastly, of the banking tablets of Jucundus, by De Petra in 1876, and Zangemeister in 1898. The earliest of the above publications, that of Marini, refers to the documents of the most recent date, which were preceded in order of time by the recently discovered Egyptian *papyri*. The author sets forth the forms of all the letters of the alphabet which are found in the Pompeian *graffiti*, in early leaden tablets, in Pompeian, Dacian, and Egyptian wax tablets, and in more than 120 *papyri* ranging in date from 14 B.C. to the middle of the seventh century.

He subsequently recapitulates the history of each letter in these dated documents, with a view to determining how far the evidence thus collected may be applied to determining the age of documents which bear no actual date. The dissertation closes with (1) a list of Greek *papyri*, which have Latin letters in their *subscriptiones* alone; (2) a bibliography; and (3) a list of abbreviations in Latin *papyri*, considered in connexion with the formation of abbreviations by 'suspension' or by 'contraction,' showing that the first of these methods was characteristic of the first four centuries. At the end of the volume we have ten plates of facsimiles of cursive alphabets, which are supplementary to the numerous alphabets reproduced in the body of the work; but we should have been glad to see a few specimens of complete documents, such as those that are given on pp. 314 to 329 of Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (1912).

The dissertation, as a whole, may be regarded as an elaborate supplement to a subordinate portion of the important work just mentioned. The treatment of the subject is of the most minute and laborious character, and the study of

the original documents has, in some cases, been obviously attended with exceptional difficulties. This may be partly inferred from two suggestive notes on pp. 136 and 172:

'Very unfortunately my study of the original documents in Vienna was limited to a brief visit to the collections on a snowy, dark day; while, in Venice, the study of a deed of gift at the church of S. Giorgio de' Greci 'was cut short by the discovery of the monk in charge that, for access to it, a special *permesso* was required, for the obtaining of which time failed.'

In the bibliography a welcome proof of scholarly candour may be observed in the use of an asterisk to distinguish titles of works which the author has not actually seen. These are generally either of very early or of very recent date, the main outlines of the work having been completed in 1910, though the date of publication is 1915. Among works which have not been seen is Chr. Wordsworth's *Inscriptiones Pompeianae* of 1837; but it may be pointed out that this is reprinted on pp. 49-81 of the same author's 'Conjectural Emen-dations . . . with other papers' of 1883. Only the second edition of Cagnat's *Cours d'épigraphie latine* (1890) is here recorded, whereas a fourth edition, with no less than twenty-eight photographic plates, including seventy-five inscriptions, appeared in the first half of 1914. Lastly, there is no mention of E. Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinae* of 1912, which includes fourteen pages of cursive facsimiles, as well as a photograph of an epitaph in the Vatican Museum in cursive characters.

The only misprints, which have been observed, are in the notes to the first few pages: *Palägraphie* for *Paläographie* on p. 1; *austae* for *auctae* on p. 7; and three words printed as one, *quoscripturae-genera* on p. 6. The work, as a whole, is undoubtedly one on which infinite pains have been successfully spent.

J. E. SANDYS.

Cambridge.

THE JEWS AMONG GREEKS AND ROMANS.

The Jews among the Greeks and Romans.

By MAX RADIN. 1 vol. 7 illustrations. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ ". Pp. 421. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915.

THE coming of the Christian religion may be regarded, from the standpoint of the classical scholar, as the addition of a Semitic element to Greco-Roman culture. In the life of the individual the same historical process is repeated in little when to Latin there is added Greek and then Hebrew. There is thus a yet unwritten chapter in the history of classical scholarship in which there may be studied the effect of this further element. The triple inscription of the Cross has therefore a symbolic value. It marked the fusion of the three greatest national cultures of antiquity. In order to profit by the clearer light which is gained, we need fortunately not take the gloomy view of Porson, who thought that fifty years reading would be required in order to make up his mind upon the problems which the incoming of this third element raises. The textual criticism to which Porson contributed so much in his own province has rendered Hebrew scholarship both more accessible and more illuminating. But the history of learning, based upon Latin and Greek and Hebrew, really began very long ago, at the moment when Jewish scholars came into contact first with Greek, and then with Latin. Hence the Hellenising tendency among the Jews—a tendency which excites the bitterest enmity of Mr. Radin—is a fact of the first importance for the study of classical antiquity. I do not understand how he reconciles 'a passionate affection for the life of ancient Greece which is frankly unreasoning' (p. 7) with the prejudice which makes him suggest that the Hellenising Jews were responsible not only for the initiation, but for the systematic carrying out of the policy of persecution which began under Antiochus Epiphanes and led to the Maccabean revolt (p. 144). In the same way we must clear ourselves of

the anti-Semitic feeling which has led to the suggestion that the Jews instigated Nero's persecution of the Christians—a suggestion which Mr. Radin rightly rejects (p. 319). There is an attitude of mind which welcomes, whether from the Jewish side or from the Hellenist side, the gain which is not merely the sum of Hellenist and Hebraic interests, but is rather the interpenetration and the consequent enrichment of the one study by the other. We must therefore deplore the distinction which Matthew Arnold emphasised between Hebraism and Hellenism, as though the pagan world, to use his phrase, was, on the coming of Hebraism, broken up. It would be far more true to say that the coming of the Christian religion took up into itself, and gave a further life to, that immense productiveness in craftsmanship and imagination which is the very essence of classical antiquity. In the East, thanks to the Greek Church, the classical tradition has never been broken. In the West it was carried down a millennium. The interval between the end of the Norman period when direct tradition failed in the West, and the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, when the Crusaders scattered what they could not destroy, was bridged by the Arab scholars of Spain. Once more through that perilous interval we have the fruitful contact of the Semitic mind with classical antiquity.

It is not always sufficiently remembered that Scaliger and Casaubon, Milton and Bentley, Goethe and Heine, owed some of their characteristic excellences just to the blending of the East and the West in their outlook. They saw life and books in a stereoscopic solidity to which their acquaintance with Hebrew was an indispensable instrument. There are many, of course, who, like Erasmus, give up the study of Hebrew, frightened off by the strangeness of the language. To such persons a book like the present offers a useful substitute. Mr. Radin writes from the inside. With a quite adequate equipment he surveys the successive points of

contact between his own race and the Greeks and Romans down to the moment when Christianity became dominant. I hope that his other readers will find his book as illuminating as I have done.

The Greeks were impressed by the philosophic turn of the Jewish nation, the Romans by the 'superstition,' their obstinate clinging to usages irreconcilable with the life of the rest of the world. As to the former quality, 'an exclusive monotheism was in every sense a philosophic and not a popular concept' (p. 84). But this monotheism was associated with customs which formed a barrier difficult to pass by the Roman proselyte. And yet the impulse towards religious satisfactions became so urgent that even the conservative Roman not seldom made the sacrifice necessary if he was to join the ghetto.

Part of Mr. Radin's hostility towards the Hellenising Jews arises out of his quite praiseworthy sympathy for those communities, synagogues, which were protected by penury from some at least of the temptations offered by the outward splendour of Greek art and life. The Jewish catacombs outside the Porta Portese at Rome enable us to reconstruct in outline the history of the Roman ghetto across the Tiber for the first four Christian centuries, a history to be traced in the admirable pages of Dr. N. Müller, who recently carried out the excavations. Dr. Müller supplements with his intimate detail the more general outlines which Mr. Radin traces. We are enabled to see the poorer Jewish synagogues across the Tiber with their close adherence to the national lan-

guage and customs over against those wealthier and more cosmopolitan synagogues who buried their dead in the Vigna Randanini. But in neither case do we find that shrinking from artistic representations which we might at first sight have looked for, at least among 'Hebrews.' We find anticipated, where we least expect, the painting and sculpture which marked the very beginnings of Christian history at Rome. Since the real life of Judaism flowed most strongly among the poor, the passing notices of Horace and Persius, and Juvenal and Martial, take on an unsuspected importance. We make a mistake if we refer the famous lines of Juvenal merely to an external incivility:

non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.

The ways which the Jews kept hid from those who neither were circumcised nor practised their religion were the ways of life and death. For we may see in the plural an allusion to the Two Ways on which was based the Teaching of the Apostles. And the fountain was that of the living water which was, among the Jews, the traditional symbol of divine truth. This interpretation accords, better than the usual one, with its context. For it furnishes a suitable climax to the passage in which these two lines occur. We must leave here the fascinating task of tracing out to their conclusions the suggestions of Mr. Radin's volume. Enough, however, has been said to show its value to the student of classical antiquity.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College,
Nottingham.

SHORT NOTICES

Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes. A. MEILLET. Onevol. 9" x 5½". Pp. xxvi + 496. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1915. 10 fr.

THIS, the fourth edition of this work, claims to be little more than a reimpression of the third edition, published in

1912. The chief changes in the original form of the book (first published in 1903) were made in the second edition, after the publication of Brugmann's *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik*, when, in addition to many corrections on points of detail, a new chapter was added, 'Sur le Développement des Dialects Indo-

Européens.' This affords a summary of the general conclusions that may be drawn from the facts stated in the body of the book, the most interesting sections being those that trace the dislocation of the Indo-European morphological system caused by the transformation of the original phonetic system, and instance a variety of causes that led to the simplification and unification of inflexion and 'la perte du sentiment de la racine.'

The book makes no pretensions to being more than a textbook, designed to indicate the main lines of the Indo-European linguistic system through the parallelisms than can be adduced between the different languages. Viewed as a textbook, it may be called above all comprehensive. It contains an excellent chapter, 'La Notion des Langues Indo-Européennes' (considerably modified in the third edition from its original form), on the theory of linguistic science. Chapter II., 'Les Langues Indo-Européennes,' contains a useful summary of

the literary records on which our knowledge of the several languages is based, while in the Appendix we have a historical account of the development of comparative grammar. There is further a special chapter, 'Sur la Vocabulaire,' in which much valuable information is collected in a convenient form. The remaining chapters, devoted to 'Phonétique,' 'Le Verbe,' 'Le Nom,' etc., are of a formal technical character, and present little matter for comment, except perhaps as regards the sections on 'Ablaut,' which leave a very confused impression on the mind and seem to contain much that is more than disputable.

The absence of a detailed index of forms detracts immeasurably from the practical utility of a great part of this work, but the more theoretical chapters have a decided value in their clearness of grasp and exposition, in addition to being eminently readable, clear, and on the whole convincing.

E. PURDIE.

NOTES AND NEWS

BOOKS FOR BRITISH PRISONERS ABROAD.

REGIMENTAL Care Committees, and relatives and friends of British prisoners of war, will do them a good service by bringing to the notice of the interned, in their letters to them, the fact that, if they are desirous of carrying on serious reading, they can obtain, free of charge, educational books on almost any subject by writing to Mr. A. T. Davies at the Board of Education, Whitehall, London, S.W. To facilitate the despatch of parcels of books and, if possible, the organisation of an educational library in every camp, all applications for books should, as a rule, be sent through, or endorsed by, the senior or other responsible British officer or N.C.O. in the camp. Where for any reason (which should be stated in the application) this course is impracticable, requests from individual prisoners will as far as possible be acceded to.

The last meeting for the session of the Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association was held on June 2nd at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and was a joint one with the local English Association to hear and discuss a paper by Mr. T. W. Moles, B.A., B.Sc., on 'Science and Humanities in School and College as affected by the War.' Mr. Basil Anderton, M.A., was in the chair; and a part in the discussion was taken by Mr. J. Talbot, M.A., B.Sc., Headmaster of the Grammar School, Dr. J. Wight Duff, the Rev. Canon Cruickshank and others. On the part of both scientific and classical representatives who spoke there was general agreement on the unwisdom of magnifying any antagonism between Arts and Science and on the need for avoiding 'panic' legislation, which might foster unripe specialism in either direction.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS.—In reply to Mr. Thomson's letter in your last issue, I considered the sentence, 'it is impossible to identify a single site described in the poem,' with some care, and came to the conclusion, in spite of the context, that Mr. Thomson meant exactly what he said. He now explains that he did not; a limitation of this most emphatic and comprehensive statement was intended, which was to be gathered from the context, and this I failed to perceive. That being so, I express my great regret that I misrepresented him.¹

I think I might well submit that the rude and dictatorial style of the rest of his letter absolves me from any obligation to notice it. But as it is possible the omission to reply might be misunderstood, I waive my right.

Mr. Thomson charges me, in terms which are certainly lacking in polish, with settling the Homeric Question — no less — 'by authority and tradition,' and so resorting to what is 'simply the old disreputable dodge of obscurantism.' But there are dodges more disreputable than obscurantism. One of these is to impute to an opponent a palpably absurd view which he does not hold, in order to win a little brief credit by demolishing the phantom with the air of a superior person. For example, Dr. Leaf's discussion in his new work did not appear to me to advance the Leukadists' case. That being so, I adhered to the view of Dörpfeld's failure which I stated recently in the *J. H. S.* As Dörpfeld fails, the Ithaka case, I argued, stands, for no one, so far as I can remember, throughout the abundant literature of the question, has ever thought of denying that the author of the controversy must prove his case, and least of all, I should think, Dörpfeld himself. It was a perfectly fair argument, but that I can leave for the present. The point is that, because the view which Dörpfeld seeks to upset was the view of the ancients, Mr. Thomson sees and seizes a chance of inducing people to believe that I regard the Homeric Question as settled for the Unitarian, or holding the field, because the ancients had a particular belief about Homer, and this though he has no reason to suppose that I regard that belief as other than one and a comparatively small element in the question. To characterise such tactics properly I should have to borrow from and improve upon his terminological store.

And, similarly, in regard to another misrepresentation. The Homeric Question is not settled. I do hold as my personal belief that the Homeric work of many great authorities, both specialists and others, and

particularly the work done of recent years, has succeeded in making a good *prima facie* case for unity, and that belief is encouraged by the consistent and continuing failure of a century's determined efforts to disintegrate the poems. It is a reasonable view which Mr. Thomson twists to unreason by representing it as an 'assumption' that Unitarianism is true because it is not disproved. A belief well grounded in good and abundant evidence, and not engendered but only confirmed by failure to invalidate it, is not to be so described. Mr. Thomson's procedure, and we know how he would stigmatise it in an opponent, is to ignore the essential part of the Unitarian case altogether and distort the rest by his own presentation of it and the misuse of a term. It is a perversion that surprises one in an authority who poses as a stickler for logical precision, and seems by his language to arrogate to himself the office of Homeric dictator.

Had he said that to me a *presumption* in favour of unity arises on the evidence that has accumulated, he would have been correct. But what then? A presumption is only a presumption and 'settles' nothing. It is satisfying, no doubt, *quantum valet*, but not settling. It may gall an opponent, floundering, it may be, in a morass of abortive endeavour, and send him *furventem in convicium*; it does not give him the right to argue a 'closed mind.' It may be rebutted; but it may also—and there perchance is the rub—grow stronger, both by the accession of positive proof and if the opposition's efforts at disproof grow wilder and weaker. Mr. Thomson no doubt takes a different view of the evidence—when he does not ignore it altogether—and feels for the Unitarian appreciation the scorn which so many feel for the traditional book. Be it so. σοι μὲν ταῦτα δοκοῦντ' ἔστω ἐμοὶ δὲ τὰδε

To eke out his case he proclaims with emphasis that satisfying proof from his side is not to be expected. In fact it is 'impossible.' The problem is apparently to be promoted to the realm where men embrace, if they embrace at all, by faith, 'believing where they cannot prove,' some of them also stubbornly disbelieving though they cannot disprove. The pronouncement has all the appearance of a lofty, transcendental conception; it is really a specious and pusillanimous expedient that will deceive few minds. To the Homerist whose grandiose theorisings have met with a cool reception it will be a comforting doctrine. Such an one naturally takes a gloomy view, and is disposed, when he contemplates the Unitarian case and compares it with his own shredded hypothesis, to long for a truce to proof and for a free rein to imagination; but we need not let his dejection, much less a take-away-that-bauble tone and strong language, prevent us from pursuing an interesting problem.

¹ This does not of course include an admission that the assertion is not fatuous in regard to Ithaka.

Proofs 'eternally impossible!' An impressive phrase! I wonder, in my turn. What would Carl Robert say if he were told, not only that he has not established his case against the *Iliad*, but that it is eternally ridiculous of him to think such a case *could* be established? What would Bethe the *bombensicher* say, or the chorizont who tells us certain evidence of his *must* be accepted, or the multitudes who have swallowed incontinently as genuine gospel the conclusions of Lachmann and Kirchhoff and Spohn and all the rest? With all respect for Mr. Thomson, I must express the opinion that this particular dictum has no sense in it.

'The truth must be sought at all costs,' and we cannot dispense with proofs. The question is not settled. We must carry on the struggle for existence, not displaying temper when things go badly, and not thinking to restrict discussion and hamper the opposition and anticipate its knocks by resorting to ambitious but hollow phrases, with nothing but *κίτος ἔφα* to back them. 'The Homeric Question is a question of scholarship.' Again, a sounding sentence, but containing only a truism that is half the truth, and incapable of interpretation till all concerned are agreed what 'scholarship' is to include. I think the word has been discussed before now in connection with the Homeric problem. And 'I do know that all this legal language is entirely beside the point.' The interdict is futile. I for one do not know that the language objected to is the exclusive property of the legal profession. It is the expression of principles which are of universal application to the discovery of truth, including the Homeric dispute as it is carried on by controversialists of the saner sort. Mr. Thomson may have forgotten, but it is not so long since Disruptionists were very insistent on a certain obligation which they said lay on Unitarians, and funnily enough they called it the *onus probandi*. And that, too, was at a time when they claimed a monopoly of 'scientific' method in a mood as bold and peremptory as Mr. Thomson's is now.

The present outburst, superlatively positive in tone, is an unfortunate reversion to the arrogant attitude towards the Unitarian belief that used to prevail in advanced circles. There is no reason in it and no reason for it. The *amari aliquid* is no doubt partly due to soreness at having to take a turn as under dog. *Haud ignarus mali*, the Unitarian can sympathise sincerely. But there is the further reason that I have made what Mr. Thomson describes as 'frequent and somewhat pointed references' to him in the *Classical Review*. These are confined, excepting the brief mention noted above, to a notice of his *Studies* (there was another in the *Classical Weekly*), and a paper on his Waterfowl Penelopé. The reviews were of course written in compliance with requests, and much more (God wot!) as a matter of duty than of pleasure, and the Penelopé theory was surely a legitimate subject for examination. The point is, was there any-

thing unfair in my dealing? There is no ground for any such suggestion. One is entitled when one sees a head to hit it, if it be uttering fancies for ascertained truth. The more discussion the better. But an unprejudiced witness may speak. The reporter on *Greek Literature* in the current *Year's Work* calls attention to these very three papers, and seems to be far indeed from finding anything objectionable in the treatment. I have, as many can testify, always expressed high admiration for the *Studies*, and few Homeric treatises have occupied me longer or to my greater eventual profit. That its author had hitched his waggon to the star—to me as to many others the *ὄλιος ἀστήρ*—of the *R. G. E.* of course put us on opposite sides in the Homeric struggle. But, though I abhorred the thesis and objected to the method, I could and did admire the fine setting which Mr. Thomson gave his theory. On the general question of the functions of Homeric criticism he and I will never agree, but I do wonder what exactly he means by reviewing a book from the author's standpoint. The handy expression might be made to connote so much or so little. It would be rash to assume that he means to exclude the exposure of unbalanced speculation and positive error, but after his predication about the eternal impossibility of proof I fear one must be prepared for any *bizarrerie*.—I am, yours, etc.,

A. SHEWAN.

June 16, 1916.

ERASMIANUM (*Vid. P. 72 ET 128*).

O ERASME venerande, quem tandem aliquando ex Orco surrexisse gaudeo, quid tibi accidit? Si tacuisses philologus fuisses! Ridiculo enim vitio sanare conabar lepidum tuum dialogum, quoniam haud credere poteram te unquam perhibuisse in tenebris de se ipso collucere aurum. Te dico, qui ut hominum vanitatem auri ignisque naturam optime perspexisti. An fugit te ignem in tenebris, aurum vero in sole fulgere? Attamen asseveras te verbis tuis e Problemate allatis spectasse non odam Nem. IV., sed odam Ol. I. Itanevero? Tunc autem confitendum tibi erit graviores esse rem, quam hucusque putarem: verba Pindarica te male vertisse, sani poetae sententiam ad insaniam te detorsisse. Legimus enim initio odæ primæ hæc: ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς αἰθόμενον πῦρ ἄτε διαπρέπει νυκτί. Quæ verba qui sunt vertenda? Audi rationem tuam, audi editores omnes, audi antiquum scholiastam, qui rectissime construxit αἰθόμενον πῦρ διαπρέπει νυκτί et optime est interpretatus: τὸ πῦρ ἐν νυκτί καίόμενον διαλάμπει. Vocabulum νυκτί cum 'αἰθόμενον πῦρ' non cum 'χρυσός,' ut brevissime dicamus, est coniungendum. Quæ tu vero scripsisti: 'aurum videtur habere plus igneae naturæ, quia noctu, velut ignis, lucet,' nullo modo stare possunt. Redi igitur, o bone, ad inferos, nam stultitiam quam cecinisti ne tu quidem prorsus effugere potuisti.

J. VÜRTHEIM.

Lugd. Bat. m. Jun. 18, 1916.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum.* Part IV., Sect. II. Supplementary and Miscellaneous Inscriptions. $17\frac{1}{2}'' \times 12''$. Pp. 107-302. By F. H. Marshall, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916. Paper boards, 30s. net.
- Ashley (R. L.)* Early European Civilisation: a textbook for Secondary Schools. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xxii+708. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.
- Bowie (W. C.)* Caesar's Wars with the Germans. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. x+86. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1916. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.
- Cahun (L.)* Pericla Navarchi Magonis, sive expeditio Phoenicia annis ante Christum mille. Opus Francice scripsit L. C., in Anglicum vertit Helena E. Frewer, Latine interpretatus est Arcadius Avellanus. $9'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. viii+336. Prostat Neo Eboraci, Sub Nro. 37^o, Via Wall. Cloth, \$5.
- Conrad (C. C.)* On Terence, Adelphoe 511-516. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 12. University of California Press, 1916. \$0.15.
- Cox (E. M.)* Sappho and the Sapphic Metre in English. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. 24. London: Chiswick Press, 1916. 1s. net.
- Deferrari (R. J.)* Lucian's Atticism: The Morphology of the Verb (Doctor's dissertation). $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. x+86. Princeton University Press and Henry Milford, 1916. 3s. 6d. net.
- Dottin (G.)* Les anciens Peuples de l'Europe. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xiv+303. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1916. Fr. 6.
- Ernout (A.)* Recueil de Textes Latins archaïques. $8'' \times 5''$. Pp. x+290. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1916.
- Fowler (H. N.)* A History of Sculpture. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xxvi+446. Illustrated. London: Macmillan and Co., 1916. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Greek Testament* (Scrivener's). Cheaper Students' Edition. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xvi+600. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1916. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Omont (H.)* Minoïde Myras, et ses Missions en Orient (1840-1855). $11'' \times 9''$. Pp. 88. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1916.
- Pickard Cambridge (A. W.)* Education, Science and the Humanities. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 32. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1916. 1s. net.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association* (January, 1916. Vol. XIII.). $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 108. London: John Murray, 1916. 2s. 6d. net.
- Rhys Roberts (W.)* Patriotic Poetry: Greek and English. An address given on the five-hundredth anniversary of Agincourt, with notes and four illustrations. $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. viii+136. London: John Murray, 1916. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Rider (B. C.)* The Greek House: Its History and Development from the Neolithic Period to the Hellenistic Age (Thesis for doctorate). $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii+272, with 53 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Thornton (J. S.)* A Forgotten Chapter in the History of Education. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 16. London: Francis Hodgson, 1916. 6d. net.
- Van Buren (A. W.)* A Bibliographical Guide to Latium and Southern Etruria. $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 28. Rome: Printed for the American Academy in Rome, 1916.

or
d
e.
-
y,
-
y,
s
.
e
.
.